arXiv:1702.04813v1 [math.OC] 15 Feb 2017

Extended formulations for convex hulls of graphs of bilinear functions

Natashia Boland[1], Akshay Gupte[2], Thomas Kalinowski[3], Fabian Rigterink[3], and Hamish Waterer[3]

[1]Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, USA
[2]Clemson University, Clemson, USA
[3]The University of Newcastle, Newcastle, Australia

February 17, 2017

Abstract

In the 1989 seminal paper, The boolean quadric polytope: Some characteristics, facets and relatives [*Mathematical Programming*, 45(1–3):139–172, 1989], Padberg introduced five classes of valid inequalities for the boolean quadric polytope: triangle, clique, cut, generalized cut, and odd cycle inequalities. These inequalities can be used to strengthen the McCormick relaxation for the graph of a bilinear function. In this paper, we make both theoretical and computational contributions. On the theoretical side, we study classes of bilinear functions where the McCormick relaxation and some of the Padberg inequalities characterize the convex hull. On the computational side, we study which of the Padberg inequalities give the strongest relaxation of the convex hull. We then apply the strong inequalities to (quadratically constrained) quadratic programs from the literature to find good lower bounds fast.

1 Introduction

An important technique in global optimization is the construction of convex envelopes for nonconvex functions (see e.g. [10]). For bilinear functions, one can relax every bilinear term linearly using its McCormick relaxation [12]. In a recent paper [4], we compared the difference between the concave upper bounding and convex lower bounding functions obtained from the term-wise McCormick relaxation to the difference between the concave and convex envelopes that characterize the convex hull. We showed that the factor between these two differences cannot be bounded by a constant that is independent of the number of variables: the term-wise McCormick relaxation can be arbitrarily worse than the convex hull. However, the McCormick inequalities are not the only inequalities known to be valid for a bilinear function. In [16], Padberg introduced new classes of inequalities that can significantly strengthen the McCormick relaxation. In this paper, we attempt to answer two natural questions arising in this context:

1. For which classes of bilinear functions do the McCormick relaxation and some of Padberg's inequalities characterize the convex hull? (See our theoretical results in Section 2.)

2. For arbitrary bilinear functions, which of Padberg's inequalities give the strongest relaxation of the convex hull? (See our computational study in Section 3.)

There is a significant amount of literature on characterizing convex hulls of graphs of nonlinear functions [17, 18]. Rikun studies the question when this convex hull is a polyhedron and gives a complete characterization for functions on polyhedral domains. Even if the convex hull is a polyhedron there might be a very large number of facets, and this is reminiscent of a situation which is quite common in combinatorial optimization: for a natural mixed integer programming (MIP) formulation the convex hull of the feasible set can be described explicitly, but it is a polytope whose number of facets is exponential

in the instance size. One approach that has been successful in this area is the use of *extended formulations* [6]. The basic idea is to introduce more variables in order to reduce the number of constraints. A reformulation of the problem with a polynomial number of constraints and polynomially many additional variables is called a *compact extended formulation*, and this is a key ingredient in so-called lift-and-project methods, and other related MIP formulation techniques [3]. In this paper, we use a similar technique: instead of describing the convex hull of a graph of a bilinear function in the original variable space, we seek to describe it in a lifted space with as few constraints as possible.

Consider a function $f : [0,1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$ of the form

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} a_{ij} x_i x_j$$

with coefficients $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$. We wish to characterize the convex hull of the graph of f, that is, the polytope

$$X(f) = \operatorname{conv}\{(\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in [0,1]^n \times \mathbb{R} : \ z = f(\boldsymbol{x})\} = \operatorname{conv}\{(\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in \{0,1\}^n \times \mathbb{R} : \ z = f(\boldsymbol{x})\},$$

where the equality was proved by Rikun [17] and Sherali [18].

As per [11], let the functions $\operatorname{vex}[f] : [0,1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\operatorname{cav}[f] : [0,1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined as $\operatorname{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \min\{z : (\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in X(f)\}$ and $\operatorname{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \max\{z : (\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in X(f)\}$, respectively. Then we have

$$X(f) = \{(\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in [0,1]^n \times \mathbb{R} : \ \operatorname{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant z \leqslant \operatorname{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x})\}.$$

Introducing variables $y_{ij} = x_i x_j$, the bilinear terms can be linearized using the well-known McCormick inequalities [12]:

$$-y_{ij} \leqslant 0, \tag{1}$$
$$-x_i + y_{ij} \leqslant 0, \tag{2}$$
$$-x_j + y_{ij} \leqslant 0, \tag{3}$$
$$x_i + x_j - y_{ij} \leqslant 1, \tag{4}$$

A related polytope is the *boolean quadric polytope* [16]

$$QP = \operatorname{conv}\left\{(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in \{0,1\}^{n(n+1)/2} : \ (1)\text{–}(4) \text{ for all } (i,j) \text{ with } 1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n\right\}.$$

The linear (continuous) relaxation of QP is

$$QP_{LP} = M = \left\{(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in [0,1]^{n(n+1)/2} : \ (1)\text{–}(4) \text{ for all } (i,j) \text{ with } 1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n\right\}.$$

We define a function $\pi[f] : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2} \to \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ by

$$\pi[f](\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \left(\boldsymbol{x}, \sum_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} a_{ij} y_{ij}\right),$$

and extend it to the power set of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2}$ in the usual way: $\pi[f](P) = \{\pi[f](\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) : (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in P\}$ for every $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n(n-1)/2}$. For a polytope $P \subseteq M$, let the functions $\operatorname{LB}_P[f] : [0,1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$ and $\operatorname{UB}_P[f] : [0,1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be defined as

$$\operatorname{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \min\left\{\sum_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} a_{ij} y_{ij} : \ (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in P\right\} = \min\{z : (\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in \pi[f](P)\}$$

and

$$\operatorname{UB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \max\left\{\sum_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} a_{ij} y_{ij} : \ (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in P\right\} = \max\{z : (\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in \pi[f](P)\},$$

respectively, so $\pi[f](P) = \{(\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in [0,1]^n \times \mathbb{R} : \mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant z \leqslant \mathrm{UB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})\}$. Then we are interested in finding a polytope $P \subseteq M$ such that

$$X(f) = \pi[f](P).$$

Equivalently, P needs to satisfy $\mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\mathrm{UB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in [0,1]^n$. It was shown in [17, 18] that the polytope $X(f)$ equals $\pi[f](QP)$. This motivates us to study polytopes P with $QP \subseteq P \subseteq QP_{LP}$ such that

- $\pi[f](P) = X(f)$ and
- P is *minimal* with this property in the sense that omitting any facet of P leads to a polytope $P' \supset P$ with $\pi[f](P') \supsetneq X(f)$.

In other words, we want to identify minimal classes of valid inequalities for QP which still ensure that the polytope defined by these inequalities satisfies $\pi[f](P) = X(f)$, the motivation being that $P \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n(n+1)/2}$ might have significantly fewer facets than $X(f) \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$.

In order to describe classes of functions for which a certain polytope P is minimal, we associate the graph $G = (V, E)$ with the function f, where the vertex set is $V = [n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ and the edge set is the *support* of f, i.e., the set $E = \mathrm{supp}(f) = \{ij : a_{ij} \neq 0\}$. Thus,

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{ij \in E} a_{ij} x_i x_j.$$

Let an edge $ij \in E$ be called positive if $a_{ij} > 0$ and negative if $a_{ij} < 0$. Note that, depending on the context, we may use either ij or $\{i, j\}$ for an edge. Abusing notation, we sometimes consider $\pi[f]$ as a function $\mathbb{R}^{n+m} \to \mathbb{R}$ where the value of m is clear from the context (the number of edges in the graph corresponding to the considered function f).

We adopt the following notation from [16]: for any $S \subseteq V$ and $T \subseteq V \setminus S$, we denote

$$E(S) = \{ij \in E : \ i, j \in S\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad E(S : T) = \{ij \in E : \ i \in S, \, j \in T\}.$$

Furthermore, let

$$x(S) = \sum_{i \in S} x_i \qquad \text{and} \qquad y(\hat{E}) = \sum_{ij \in \hat{E}} y_{ij} \quad \text{for any } \hat{E} \subseteq E.$$

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: in Section 2.1.1, we collect some facets of QP (Padberg inequalities), and in Section 2.1.2, we collect some known results on minimal polytopes P for certain functions f (described in terms or their associated graphs). Section 2.2 extends these results to some more functions (using the Padberg inequalities, but also some other inequalities). Finally, Section 2.3 contains the proofs of the results listed in Section 2.2. In Section 3, we give the results of a computational study, in which we apply Padberg's inequalities to random graphs and (quadratically constrained) quadratic programs to determine which of the inequalities are strongest. Finally, Section 4 concludes the paper with a summary of the main results and some remaining open questions.

2 Theoretical results

2.1 Known results

2.1.1 Classes of inequalities

The following results are a short summary of known classes of inequalities (which we refer to as Padberg inequalities). For this subsection let $G = (V, E)$ be the complete graph on n vertices, K_n.

Result 1 (McCormick inequalities, [16], Propositions 3–5)**.** *The* McCormick inequalities (1)–(4) *define facets of QP for all* $1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n$.

Result 2 (Triangle inequalities, [16], p. 143)**.** *The* triangle inequalities

$$x_i + x_j + x_k - y_{ij} - y_{ik} - y_{jk} \leqslant 1, \tag{5}$$
$$-x_i + y_{ij} + y_{ik} - y_{jk} \leqslant 0, \tag{6}$$
$$-x_j + y_{ij} - y_{ik} + y_{jk} \leqslant 0, \tag{7}$$
$$-x_k - y_{ij} + y_{ik} + y_{jk} \leqslant 0, \tag{8}$$

define facets of QP for all $1 \leqslant i < j < k \leqslant n$.

Result 3 (Clique inequality, [16], Theorem 4)**.** *For any* $S \subseteq V$ *with* $|S| \geqslant 3$ *and integer* α, $1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant |S|-2$, *the* clique inequality

$$\alpha x(S) - y(E(S)) \leqslant \frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2} \tag{9}$$

defines a facet of QP. The number of distinct facets of QP defined this way equals $(n-4)2^{n-1} + n + 2$.

Note that for $|S| = 3$ and $\alpha = 1$, (9) equals (5).

Result 4 (Cut inequality, [16], Theorem 5)**.** *For any* $S \subseteq V$ *with* $|S| \geqslant 1$ *and* $T \subseteq V \setminus S$ *with* $|T| \geqslant 2$, *the* cut inequality

$$-x(S) - y(E(S)) + y(E(S:T)) - y(E(T)) \leqslant 0 \tag{10}$$

defines a facet of QP. The number of distinct facets of QP defined this way equals $3^n - (n+4)2^{n-1} + n + 1$.

Note that for $|S| = 1$ and $|T| = 2$, (10) equals (6)–(8).

Result 5 (Generalized cut inequality, [16], Corollary 1)**.** *For any* $S \subseteq V$ *with* $s = |S| \geqslant 1$ *and* $T \subseteq V \setminus S$ *with* $t = |T| \geqslant 2$, *the* generalized cut inequality

$$(s-t)x(S) + (t-s-1)x(T) - y(E(S)) + y(E(S:T)) - y(E(T)) \leqslant \frac{1}{2}(t-s)(t-s-1) \tag{11}$$

defines a facet of QP.

Note that for $t = s$ and $t = s+1$, (11) equals (10).

Result 6 (Odd cycle inequality, [16], Proposition 6)**.** *Let* $C \subseteq E$ *be a cycle,* $|C| \geqslant 3$, *and* $D \subseteq C$, $d = |D| \geqslant 1$, *be any subset of* C *with odd cardinality. Set*

$$V_0 = \{u \in V : \ e \cap \hat{e} = \{u\} \text{ for some } e, \hat{e} \in D\},$$
$$V_1 = \{u \in V : \ e \cap \hat{e} = \{u\} \text{ for some } e, \hat{e} \in C \setminus D\},$$

where $e \cap \hat{e} = \{u\}$ *if and only if* $u \in e = \{i, j\}$ *and* $u \in \hat{e} = \{\hat{i}, \hat{j}\}$. *Then the* odd cycle inequality

$$x(V_0) - x(V_1) + y(C \setminus D) - y(D) \leqslant \lfloor d/2 \rfloor \tag{12}$$

is valid for QP, and every odd cycle inequality (12) *can be written as a sum of a number of inequalities* (6)–(8) *plus exactly* $\lfloor d/2 \rfloor$ *inequalities* (5).

Note that for $C = \{ij, ik, jk\}$ and

- $D = C$, (12) equals (5),
- $D = \{jk\}$, (12) equals (6),
- $D = \{ik\}$, (12) equals (7),
- $D = \{ij\}$, (12) equals (8).

For Results 1–6, see also [19]. Table 1 shows the inequalities obtained from applying these results to $G = K_4$, the complete graph on four vertices. The column labeled "Ieqs" shows the constraint label for each inequality class (5)–(12) of which the constraint is an instance. For example, constraint #25, $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 - y_{12} - y_{13} - y_{23} \leqslant 1$, is an instance of inequality classes (5) (triangle), 9 (clique), and 12 (odd cycle). Table 1 allows us to observe that the inequality classes often intersect, i.e., a constraint is often an instance of several inequality classes. A Venn diagram showing these intersections is given in Figure 1. For example, every instance of inequality class (5) is also an instance of (9) and (12), and every instance of both (9) and (12) is also an instance of (5). However, there are instances of (9) which are exclusively instances of (9) (the same holds for instances of (10), (11), and (12)).

Table 1: All triangle (5)–(8), clique (9), cut (10), generalized cut (11), and odd cycle (12) inequalities for $G = K_4$. The inequalities are all of the form $\sum_{i \in V} a_i x_i + \sum_{ij \in E} b_{ij} y_{ij} \leqslant c$ with the values of a_i, b_{ij}, and c shown below. The McCormick inequalities (1)–(4) which give ieqs #1–24, are omitted.

	a_i, $i =$				b_{ij}, $ij =$							
#	1	2	3	4	12	13	14	23	24	34	c	Ieqs
25	1	1	1		-1	-1		-1			1	5, 9, 12
26	-1				1	1		-1			0	6, 10, 11, 12
27		-1			1	-1		1			0	7, 10, 11, 12
28			-1		-1	1		1			0	8, 10, 11, 12
29	1	1		1	-1		-1		-1		1	5, 9, 12
30	-1				1		1		-1		0	6, 10, 11, 12
31		-1			1		-1		1		0	7, 10, 11, 12
32				-1	-1		1		1		0	8, 10, 11, 12
33	1		1	1		-1	-1			-1	1	5, 9, 12
34	-1					1	1			-1	0	6, 10, 11, 12
35			-1			1	-1			1	0	7, 10, 11, 12
36				-1		-1	1			1	0	8, 10, 11, 12
37		1	1	1				-1	-1	-1	1	5, 9, 12
38		-1						1	1	-1	0	6, 10, 11, 12
39			-1					1	-1	1	0	7, 10, 11, 12
40				-1				-1	1	1	0	8, 10, 11, 12
41	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1	9
42	2	2	2	2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	3	9
43	-1				1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	0	10
44		-1			1	-1	-1	1	1	-1	0	10
45	-1	-1			-1	1	1	1	1	-1	0	10, 11
46			-1		-1	1	-1	1	-1	1	0	10
47	-1		-1		1	-1	1	1	-1	1	0	10, 11
48		-1	-1		1	1	-1	-1	1	1	0	10, 11
49				-1	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	0	10
50	-1			-1	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	0	10, 11
51		-1		-1	1	-1	1	1	-1	1	0	10, 11
52			-1	-1	-1	1	1	1	1	-1	0	10, 11

	a_i, $i =$				b_{ij}, $ij =$							
#	1	2	3	4	12	13	14	23	24	34	c	Ieqs
53	-2	1	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	1	11
54	1	-2	1	1	1	-1	-1	1	1	-1	1	11
55	1	1	-2	1	-1	1	-1	1	-1	1	1	11
56	1	1	1	-2	-1	-1	1	-1	1	1	1	11
57			-1	-1	-1	1			1	1	0	12
58	-1		-1		1	1			-1	1	0	12
59		-1		-1	1	-1			1	1	0	12
60	1	1			-1	-1			-1	1	1	12
61	-1	-1			1	1			1	-1	0	12
62		1		1	-1	1			-1	-1	1	12
63	1		1		-1	-1			1	-1	1	12
64			1	1	1	-1			-1	-1	1	12
65			-1	-1	-1		1	1		1	0	12
66	-1			-1	1		1	-1		1	0	12
67	-1	-1			1		1	1		-1	0	12
68		1	1		-1		1	-1		-1	1	12
69		-1	-1		1		-1	1		1	0	12
70	1	1			-1		-1	-1		1	1	12
71	1			1	-1		-1	1		-1	1	12
72			1	1	1		-1	-1		-1	1	12
73		-1		-1		-1	1	1	1		0	12
74	-1		-1			1	1	1	-1		0	12
75	-1			-1		1	1	-1	1		0	12
76		1	1			-1	1	-1	-1		1	12
77		-1	-1			1	-1	1	1		0	12
78	1			1		-1	-1	1	-1		1	12
79	1		1			-1	-1	-1	1		1	12
80		1		1		1	-1	-1	-1		1	12



Figure 1: Venn diagram showing the intersections of classes of inequalities from [16]: (5)–(8) = triangle, (9) = clique, (10) = cut, (11) = generalized cut, (12) = odd cycle (the McCormick inequalities (1)–(4) are omitted). A circled inequality indicates an inequality class; a non-circled inequality indicates an intersection of inequality classes.

2.1.2 Convex hull characterisations

The following results are a short summary of known convex hull characterisations. See [4, 7, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20] for details.

Result 7 ([11], see also [20]). *If all edges are positive, then*

$$\operatorname{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{ij \in E} a_{ij} \min\{x_i, x_j\}.$$

Result 8 ([14], see also [4]). *The polytope $X(f)$ equals $\pi[f](M)$ if and only if every cycle in G has an even number of positive edges and an even number of negative edges. In particular, $X(f)$ equals $\pi[f](M)$ if all edges are positive and G is bipartite. (The latter result was proven in [7] before the more general result was proven in [4, 14].)*

Result 9 (Cliques [17], see also [18]). *If $G = K_n$, then $X(f) = \pi[f](P)$ where*

$$P = \left\{ (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in M \ : \ sx(V) - y(E) \leqslant \frac{s(s+1)}{2}, \ s = 1, \dots, n-2 \right\}. \tag{13}$$

Moreover, each of the $n-2$ inequalities in (13) is necessary in the sense that its omission leads to a polytope $P' \supsetneq P$ such that $X(f) \subsetneq \pi[f](P')$.

Observe that the inequalities in (13) are Padberg's clique inequalities (9) for $S = V = [n]$. Result 9 was proven by Rikun [17], and was mentioned as a special case by Sherali [18].

2.2 New results

In this section, we state our main theoretical results. The results in Section 2.2.1 hold for positive unit coefficients $a_{ij} = 1$, and the results in Section 2.2.2 hold for general coefficients $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$. The new results will later be proved in Section 2.3.

2.2.1 Positive unit coefficients ($a_{ij} = 1$ for all $ij \in E$)

Theorem 1 (Almost cliques). *If $G = K_n^-$, that is, the graph obtained from K_n by deleting the edge between vertices $n-1$ and n, then $X(f) = \pi[f](P)$ where $P \subseteq [0,1]^{n(n+1)/2}$ is described by the McCormick inequalities together with*

$$sx(\{1, \dots, n-1\}) - y(E(\{1, \dots, n-1\})) \leqslant \frac{s(s+1)}{2}, \qquad s = 1, \dots, n-3, \tag{14}$$

$$sx(\{1, \dots, n-2, n\}) - y(E(\{1, \dots, n-2, n\})) \leqslant \frac{s(s+1)}{2}, \qquad s = 1, \dots, n-3, \tag{15}$$

$$sx(V) - y(E) - y_{n-1,n} \leqslant \frac{s(s+1)}{2}, \qquad s = 2, \dots, n-2. \tag{16}$$

Moreover, each of these $3n-9$ inequalities is necessary in the sense that its omission leads to a polytope $P' \supsetneq P$ such that $X(f) \subsetneq \pi[f](P')$.

Note that all inequalities in Theorem 1 are Padberg's clique inequalities: (14) and (15) for the maximal cliques in G and (16) for K_n.

Theorem 2 (Triangular book graphs). *If $G = K_{1,1,n-2}$, that is, the complete tripartite graph that occurs when*

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = x_1 x_2 + \sum_{k=3}^{n} (x_1 + x_2) x_k,$$

then $X(f) = \pi[f](P)$ where

$$P = \{ (\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in M \ : \ x_1 + x_2 + x_k - y_{12} - y_{2k} - y_{1k} \leqslant 1, \ k = 3, \dots, n \}. \tag{17}$$

Moreover, each of the $n-2$ inequalities in (17) is necessary in the sense that its omission leads to a polytope $P' \supsetneq P$ such that $X(f) \subsetneq \pi[f](P')$.

Note that the inequalities in (17) are Padberg's triangle inequalities (5) for the $n-2$ triangles $\{i,j,k\} \in \{\{1,2,3\},\dots,\{1,2,n\}\}$. We conclude this section with a few observations:

Observation 1 (Relationship to STAB(G))**.** *Note that* $\mathrm{STAB}(G) = \mathrm{conv}\{\boldsymbol{x} \in \{0,1\}^n : f(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0\}$ *and* $\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = 0 \iff \boldsymbol{x} \in \mathrm{STAB}(G)$*. In some sense,* $\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ *is a measure of how far away* $\boldsymbol{x}$ *is from* $\mathrm{STAB}(G)$*.*

Definition 1 (k-wheel)**.** The k-wheel W_k is a graph that contains a cycle of length k, and for which one vertex, $i = 0$ (known as the hub), is adjacent to every vertex $j = 1,\dots,k$ in the cycle.

Observation 2 (5-wheel)**.** *If* $G = W_5$*, then* $X(f) = \pi[f](P)$ *where*

$$P = \{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in M \ : \ 2x_0 + x_1 + \cdots + x_5 - y(E) \leqslant 2,\ 3x_0 + 2(x_1 + \cdots + x_5) - y(E) \leqslant 5\}. \tag{18}$$

Note that both inequalities are necessary and cannot be obtained by sequentially lifting the 5-cycle inequality.

The inequalities in (18) are not implied by Padberg's inequalities. This can be seen by the two vectors illustrated in Figure 2.



Figure 2: The vertex and edge labels represent two vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{6+15}$. The point on the left satisfies all Padberg inequalities and the second inequality in (18), but not the first one, while the point on the right satisfies all Padberg inequalities and the first inequality in (18), but not the second one.

Definition 2 (Chordal graph)**.** A chordal graph is a graph without induced cycles of length 4 or more.

Observation 3 (Clique inequalities are insufficient for chordal graphs)**.** *If*

$$P = \{(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in M \ : \ (9) \text{ for every clique in } G\}$$

and G *is the graph depicted in Figure 3, then* $X(f) \subsetneq \pi[f](P)$*. To see this consider the point* $(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in P$ *where* $\boldsymbol{x} = (1/2, 1/2, \dots, 1/2)$*,* $y_{13} = y_{23} = 1/2$*, and* $y_{ij} = 0$ *for all other edges* $ij \in E$*. Then* $\pi[f](\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = (\boldsymbol{x}, 1) \notin X(f)$ *as*

$$z \geqslant 2x_1 + 2x_2 + 3x_3 + x_4 + x_5 + x_6 + x_7 - 4$$

is a valid inequality for $X(f)$*. This inequality is the sum of the following cycle and clique inequalities:*

$$\begin{aligned} y_{12} + y_{26} + y_{36} + y_{35} + y_{15} &\geqslant x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_5 + x_6 - 2, \\ y_{13} + y_{34} + y_{14} &\geqslant x_1 + x_3 + x_4 - 1, \\ y_{23} + y_{27} + y_{37} &\geqslant x_2 + x_3 + x_7 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

However, it is the case that $X(f) = \pi[f](P)$ *for the graph that results from deleting vertex 7 in the graph depicted in Figure 3.*



Figure 3: A chordal graph.



Figure 4: Another chordal graph.

Observation 4 (Cliques and cycles are insufficient for chordal graphs)**.** *For the graph in Figure 4, the point* $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ *with* $x_i = 1/2$ *for all* $i \in V$*,* $y_{12} = y_{23} = y_{13} = 5/18$*, and* $y_{ij} = 1/18$ *for all other* $ij \in E$*, satisfies all cycle and clique inequalities, but* $\pi[f](\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = (\boldsymbol{x}, 7/6) \notin X(f)$ *because it violates the inequality*

$$2x_1 + 2x_2 + 2x_3 + 2x_4 + x_5 - z \leqslant 3.$$

That this is a valid inequality for $X(f)$ *can be verified by checking it for the integer points.*

2.2.2 General coefficients $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$

Theorem 3 (Cycles)**.** *Let* G *be an* n*-cycle with edges* $\{i, i+1\}$ *for* $i \in [n-1]$ *and* $\{1, n\}$*. We write* a_i *instead of* $a_{i,i+1}$ *for* $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$ *and* a_n *instead of* a_{1n}*, and we introduce the following notation:*

$$E^- = \{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ : \ a_i < 0\}, \qquad E^+ = \{i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \ : \ a_i > 0\},$$
$$V^- = \{i \in V \ : \ i-1, i \in E^-\}, \qquad V^+ = \{i \in V \ : \ i-1, i \in E^+\}.$$

Then $\pi[f](P) = X(f)$ *where* $P \subseteq [0,1]^{2n}$ *is the polytope described by the McCormick inequalities and*

$$x(V^-) - x(V^+) + y(E^+) - y(E^-) \leqslant \left\lfloor \frac{|E^-|}{2} \right\rfloor, \tag{19}$$

$$x(V^+) - x(V^-) + y(E^-) - y(E^+) \leqslant \left\lfloor \frac{|E^+|}{2} \right\rfloor. \tag{20}$$

Moreover, (19) *(resp.* (20)*) can be omitted if* $|E^-|$ *(resp.* $|E^+|$*) is even.*

Note that inequalities (19) (resp. (20)) are Padberg's odd cycle inequalities (12) for $C = E^+$ and $D = E^-$ (resp. for $C = E^-$ and $D = E^+$).

2.2.3 On the number of facets

To illustrate that P might have significantly fewer facets than $X(f)$, we computed the number of facets for small cliques, almost cliques, triangular book graphs, and cycles, as shown in Table 2. For $X(f)$, we enumerated all 2^n extreme points $\boldsymbol{x}^i$ of $[0,1]^n$, calculated the corresponding $z^i = f(\boldsymbol{x}^i)$, and used `polymake` 2.13.1 [1, 2] (polymake.org) to compute the facets of $X(f)$. Table 2 suggests the following:

- For cliques K_n, $X(f)$ has $n! + 3n$ facets, while P has $2n^2 + n - 2$ ($2n$ variable bounds, $4n(n-1)/2$ McCormick inequalities, and $n-2$ inequalities (13)).
- For almost cliques K_n^-, $X(f)$ has $n! - (n-1)! + 2^{n-2} + 4(n-1)$ facets for $n \geqslant 4$, while P has $2n^2 + 3n - 9$ (bounds, McCormick, and $3n-9$ inequalities (14)–(16)).
- For triangular book graphs $K_{1,1,n-2}$, $X(f)$ has $4 \cdot 3^{n-2} - (n+2)2^{n-3} + 2(n+1)$ facets, while P has $11n - 14$ (bounds, McCormick, and $n-2$ inequalities (17)).

Table 2: Number of facets of $X(f)$ and P for cliques K_n, almost cliques K_n^-, triangular book graphs $K_{1,1,n-2}$, and cycles C_n, for $n = 3, \ldots, 8$. For K_n, K_n^-, and $K_{1,1,n-2}$, we choose $a_{ij} = 1$. For C_n, we choose $a_{i,i+1} = 1$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, p$ where $p = \lfloor (n+1)/4 \rfloor + \lceil (n+1)/4 \rceil$, and $a_{i,i+1} = -1$ for all $i = p+1, \ldots, n$ (modulo n in the obvious way). Choosing these coefficients for C_n is to avoid Result 8.

	K_n		K_n^-		$K_{1,1,n-2}$		C_n	
n	$X(f)$	P	$X(f)$	P	$X(f)$	P	$X(f)$	P
3	15	19	12	18	15	19	15	20
4	36	34	34	35	34	30	26	26
5	135	53	120	56	92	41	63	32
6	738	76	636	81	274	52	118	38
7	5,061	103	4,376	110	844	63	255	44
8	40,344	134	35,372	143	2,614	74	498	50

- For cycles C_n with the coefficients given in the Table's caption, $X(f)$ has $4^{(n+1)/2} - 1$ facets if n is odd, and has $2 \cdot 4^{n/2} - 2n + 2$ facets if n is even, while P has $6n + 2$ (bounds, McCormick, and 2 inequalities (19)–(20)).

Note that the given explicit formulas for the numbers of facets of $X(f)$ are just the result of observing patterns in Table 2, and at this point we do not have any rigorous argument for them. Also note that computing the facets of $X(f)$ is only possible for small n. Therefore, confirming the explicit formulas for larger n becomes computationally very expensive.

2.3 Proofs of new results

2.3.1 A geometric method for characterizing convex hulls

Zuckerberg [21, 22] developed a technique to prove convex hull characterizations for subsets of the cube $\{0,1\}^n$. In this subsection we simplify one of the technical results from this work and extend to the convex hulls of graphs of functions $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. For the purpose of stating Zuckerberg's result, let $A_i = \{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \{0,1\}^n \ : \ \xi_i = 1\}$, let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ be a subset, and let $F(\{A_i\})$ be a representation of $\mathcal{F}$ as a finite combination of unions, intersections and complementations of the sets $A_1, \ldots, A_n$. Then Theorem 7 in [22] can be stated as follows. Let $\boldsymbol{x} \in [0,1]^n$. If there exist

- an algebra $\mathcal{Q} = (U, \mathcal{L})$ with a probability measure $\|\cdot\|$[1], and
- sets $S_1, \ldots, S_n \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\|S_i\| = x_i$ for all $i \in [n]$ and $\|F(\{S_i\})\| = 1$

then $\boldsymbol{x} \in \operatorname{conv}(\mathcal{F})$. We will show that some of the technicalities in this statement and its proof can be removed. In particular, it is sufficient to consider $U = [0,1)$ with $\mathcal{L}$ being the collection of unions of finitely many half-open intervals and $\|\cdot\|$ the Lebesgue measure (restricted to $\mathcal{L}$), i.e.,

$$\mathcal{L} = \{[a_1, b_1) \cup \cdots \cup [a_k, b_k) \ : \ 0 \leqslant a_1 < b_1 < a_2 < b_2 < \cdots < a_k < b_k \leqslant 1, \ k \in \mathbb{N}\}, \tag{21}$$

$$\|S\| = (b_1 - a_1) + \cdots + (b_k - a_k) \qquad \text{for } [a_1, b_1) \cup \cdots \cup [a_k, b_k) \in \mathcal{L}. \tag{22}$$

As a consequence the condition $\|F(\{S_i\})\| = 1$, can be replaced by $F(\{S_i\}) = U$, and in fact the set theoretic representation of $\mathcal{F}$ can be avoided completely using the standard identification of the elements of $\{0,1\}^n$ with subsets of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. More precisely, we have the following result.

Theorem 4. *Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$, $\boldsymbol{x} \in [0,1]^n$, and let $\mathcal{L}$ and $\|\cdot\|$ be defined by (21) and (22). Then $\boldsymbol{x} \in \operatorname{conv}(\mathcal{F})$ if and only if there are sets $X_1, \ldots, X_n \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\|X_i\| = x_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, and $\{i \ : \ t \in X_i\} \in \mathcal{F}$ for every $t \in [0,1)$.*

Theorem 4 implies Zuckerberg's criterion since $F(\{X_i\}) = \{t \in [0,1) \ : \ \{i \ : \ t \in X_i\} \in \mathcal{F}\}$.

[1]Note that this is a slight abuse of terminology as we only require that $\mathcal{L}$ is closed under finite unions, and $\|\cdot\|$ is finitely additive.

Proof. Let us fix an ordering $\boldsymbol{\xi}^1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{\xi}^{|\mathcal{F}|}$ of $\mathcal{F}$, and suppose $\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathrm{conv}(\mathcal{F})$, say $\boldsymbol{x} = \lambda_k \boldsymbol{\xi}^k + \cdots + \lambda_{|\mathcal{F}|}\boldsymbol{\xi}^{|\mathcal{F}|}$. We define a partition $U = I_1 \cup \cdots \cup I_{|\mathcal{F}|}$ by setting $I_1 = [0, \lambda_1)$ and $I_k = [\lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_{k-1},\ \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_k)$ for $k \in \{2, \ldots, |\mathcal{F}|\}$. The required sets X_i can be defined as

$$X_i = \bigcup_{k\,:\,\xi_i^k = 1} I_k.$$

Conversely, if X_i are sets with the described properties, we can set

$$\lambda_k = \left\| \left\{ t \ :\ \{i \ :\ t \in X_i\} = \boldsymbol{\xi}^k \right\} \right\|$$

for $k = 1, \ldots, |\mathcal{F}|$ to obtain the required convex representations $\boldsymbol{x} = \lambda_k \boldsymbol{\xi}^k + \cdots + \lambda_{|\mathcal{F}|}\boldsymbol{\xi}^{|\mathcal{F}|}$. □

Next we extend this approach to apply to the convex hull $X(f)$ of the graph of a function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. For sets $X_1, \ldots, X_n \in \mathcal{L}$ we partition U into 2^n subsets $R_\xi(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ ($\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \{0,1\}^n$) defined by

$$R_\xi(X_1, \ldots, X_n) = \{t \in [0,1) \ :\ \{i \in [n] \ :\ t \in X_i\} = \boldsymbol{\xi}\}.$$

Let us define two functions $f_-, f_+ : [0,1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$

$$f_-(\boldsymbol{x}) = \min \left\{ \sum_{\xi \in \{0,1\}^n} \|R_\xi(X_1, \ldots, X_n)\|\, f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \ :\ X_i \in \mathcal{L},\ \|X_i)\| = x_i \text{ for all } i \in [n] \right\},$$

$$f_+(\boldsymbol{x}) = \max \left\{ \sum_{\xi \in \{0,1\}^n} \|R_\xi(X_1, \ldots, X_n)\|\, f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \ :\ X_i \in \mathcal{L},\ \|X_i)\| = x_i \text{ for all } i \in [n] \right\}.$$

Theorem 5. *We have* $X(f) = \{(\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in [0,1]^n \times \mathbb{R} \ :\ f_-(\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant z \leqslant f_+(\boldsymbol{x})\}$.

Proof. First suppose $(\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in X(f)$, say

$$(\boldsymbol{x},\ z) = \sum_{\xi \in \{0,1\}^n} \lambda(\boldsymbol{\xi})(\boldsymbol{\xi}, f(\boldsymbol{\xi})).$$

As in the proof of Theorem 4 we define sets $X_i \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\|X_i\| = x_i$. Note that $R_\xi(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ is the interval corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\xi}$, hence $\|R_\xi(X_1, \ldots, X_n)\| = \lambda(\boldsymbol{\xi})$. It follows that $f_-(\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant z \leqslant f_+(\boldsymbol{x})$. For the converse, suppose $f_-(\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant z \leqslant f_+(\boldsymbol{x})$, and let $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ and $(X'_1, \ldots, X'_n)$ be optimizers for problems defining $f_-(\boldsymbol{x})$ and $f_+(\boldsymbol{x})$, respectively. We can write $z = tf_-(\boldsymbol{x}) + (1-t)f_+(\boldsymbol{x})$ for some $t \in [0,1]$, and setting

$$\lambda(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = t\|R_\xi(X_1, \ldots, X_n)\| + (1-t)\|R_\xi(X'_1, \ldots, X'_n),$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \{0,1\}^n$ we obtain the required convex representation

$$(\boldsymbol{x}, z) = \sum_{\xi \in \{0,1\}^n} \lambda(\boldsymbol{\xi})(\boldsymbol{\xi}, f(\boldsymbol{\xi})).$$ □

For the particular case that the function f has the form $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{ij \in E} a_{ij} x_i x_j$, Theorem 5 yields the following interpretation for $\mathrm{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x})$.

Corollary 1. *We have*

$$\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \min \left\{ \sum_{ij \in E} a_{ij} \|X_i \cap X_j\| \ :\ X_i \in \mathcal{L},\ \|X_i\| = x_i \text{ for all } i \in [n] \right\},$$

$$\mathrm{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \max \left\{ \sum_{ij \in E} a_{ij} \|X_i \cap X_j\| \ :\ X_i \in \mathcal{L},\ \|X_i\| = x_i \text{ for all } i \in [n] \right\}.$$

Proof. We just observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\xi\in\{0,1\}^n} \|R_\xi(X_1,\dots,X_n)\|\, f(\boldsymbol{\xi}) &= \sum_{\xi\in\{0,1\}^n} \|R_\xi(X_1,\dots,X_n)\| \sum_{ij\in E} a_{ij}\xi_i\xi_j \\
&= \sum_{ij\in E} a_{ij} \sum_{\xi\in\{0,1\}^n} \|R_\xi(X_1,\dots,X_n)\|\, \xi_i\xi_j \\
&= \sum_{ij\in E} a_{ij} \sum_{\xi\in\{0,1\}^n\,:\,\xi_i=\xi_j=1} \|\{t\in[0,1)\ :\ \{k\in[n]\ :\ t\in X_k\}=\boldsymbol{\xi}\}\| \\
&= \sum_{ij\in E} a_{ij} \left\| \bigcup_{\xi\in\{0,1\}^n\,:\,\xi_i=\xi_j=1} \{t\in[0,1)\ :\ \{k\in[n]\ :\ t\in X_k\}=\boldsymbol{\xi}\} \right\| \\
&= \sum_{ij\in E} a_{ij}\, \|X_i\cap X_j\|\,.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Example 1. The sets X_i illustrated in Figure 5 correspond to the representation

$$\begin{pmatrix}0.6\\0.3\\0.3\\0.9\\0.4\end{pmatrix} = 0.1\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\\1\\1\\0\end{pmatrix} + 0.1\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\\1\\0\\1\end{pmatrix} + 0.3\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\\0\\1\\1\end{pmatrix} + 0.1\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\\0\\1\\0\end{pmatrix} + 0.3\begin{pmatrix}0\\1\\0\\1\\0\end{pmatrix} + 0.1\begin{pmatrix}0\\0\\1\\1\\0\end{pmatrix},$$

and if f has all coefficients equal to 1 this provides a certificate for

$$\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant (0.1+0.1+0.3)\times 3 + (0.1+0.3+0.1)\times 1 = 2.$$



Figure 5: Illustration of the sets X_i in Example 1.

2.3.2 Alternative proof of Result 9

In view of Result 7, the statement is a consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Let* $s = \lfloor x_1+\cdots+x_n\rfloor$. *Then* $\mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = s(x_1+\cdots+x_n) - \binom{s+1}{2}$.

Proof. Since $\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \geqslant \mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ it is sufficient to show that

$$\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant s(x_1+\cdots+x_n) - \binom{s+1}{2}, \tag{23}$$

$$\mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \geqslant s(x_1+\cdots+x_n) - \binom{s+1}{2}. \tag{24}$$

In order to show (23) using Corollary 1 we concatenate intervals of lengths $x_1,\ldots,x_n$ and obtain sets $X_i \subseteq [0,1)$ by interpreting the result modulo $\mathbb{Z}$. More formally, the sets X_i are defined as follows: for $i=1$, put $X_1=[0,x_1)$. Now let $i \geqslant 2$, suppose X_{i-1} has been defined already, set $b=\sup X_{i-1}$, and put

$$X_i = \begin{cases} [b, b+x_i) & \text{if } b+x_i \leqslant 1, \\ [b,1) \cup [0, x_i-(1-b)) & \text{if } b+x_i > 1. \end{cases}$$

This construction is illustrated in Figure 6 where $s=\lfloor 2.5 \rfloor = 2$. Now $[0,1)=A\cup B$, where



Figure 6: Illustration of the construction of the sets X_i in the proof of Lemma 1.

$$A=\{t\in[0,1)\ :\ |\{i\ :\ t\in X_i\}|=s\},\quad B=\{t\in[0,1)\ :\ |\{i\ :\ t\in X_i\}|=s+1\},$$

and $\|B\|=(x_1+\cdots+x_n)-s$, $\|A\|=s+1-(x_1+\cdots+x_n)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}\|X_i\cap X_j\| &= \binom{s}{2}\|A\|+\binom{s+1}{2}\|B\| \\ &= \binom{s}{2}\left[s+1-(x_1+\cdots+x_n)\right]+\binom{s+1}{2}\left[(x_1+\cdots+x_n)-s\right] \\ &= (x_1+\cdots+x_n)\left[\binom{s+1}{2}-\binom{s}{2}\right]+(s+1)\binom{s}{2}-s\binom{s+1}{2} \\ &= s(x_1+\cdots+x_n)-\binom{s+1}{2},\end{aligned}$$

and this implies (23). If $s<n-1$ then (24) is obvious: for $s=0$ the right-hand side is zero, and for $1\leqslant s\leqslant n-2$,

$$\sum_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} y_{ij} \geqslant s(x_1+\cdots+x_n)-\binom{s+1}{2}$$

is one of the clique inequalities. If $s=n-1$ then $x_i+x_j\geqslant 1$ for every $ij\in E$, and the McCormick inequalities imply

$$\sum_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} y_{ij} \geqslant \sum_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n}(x_i+x_j-1) = (n-1)(x_1+\ldots+x_n)-\binom{n}{2}.$$

Finally, if $s=n$ then

$$\sum_{1\leqslant i<j\leqslant n} y_{ij} = \binom{n}{2} = n^2-\binom{n+1}{2} = n(x_1+\cdots+x_n)-\binom{n+1}{2}. \qquad \square$$

2.3.3 Proof of Theorem 1

We will establish this result by proving $\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant \mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$. Without loss of generality we assume $x_n \leqslant x_{n-1}$ and $x_1 \geqslant x_2 \geqslant \cdots \geqslant x_{n-2}$, and we proceed as follows. We start with $X_n = [0, x_n)$ and $X_{n-1} = [0, x_{n-1})$ and construct the sets $X_1, \ldots, X_{n-2}$ as described in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Construction of the sets X_i in the proof of Theorem 1

$(a, b) \leftarrow (x_n, x_{n-1})$
for $k = 2, 3, \ldots, n-2$ **do**
  if $x_k \leqslant 1 - b$ **then**
    $X_k \leftarrow [b, b + x_k)$
    $b \leftarrow b + x_k$
  else if $x_k \leqslant 1 - a$ **then**
    $X_k \leftarrow [b, 1) \cup [a, a + x_k + b - 1)$
    $(a, b) \leftarrow (a + x_k + b - 1, 1)$
  else
    $X_k \leftarrow [a, 1) \cup [0, x_k + a - 1)$
    $a \leftarrow x_k + a - 1$

Example 2. For $n = 6$ two different outcomes of Algorithm 1 are illustrated in Figure 7: For $\boldsymbol{x} = (0.9, 0.6, 0.2, 0.1, 0.6, 0.4)$ the algorithm terminates with $b = 1$, while for $\boldsymbol{x} = (0.9, 0.8, 0.2, 0.1, 0.6, 0.4)$, we have still $b < 1$ in the end.



Figure 7: The sets X_i constructed by Algorithm 1 for two vectors $\boldsymbol{x}$.

Setting $y_{ij} = \|X_i \cap X_j\|$ for all $ij \in E$, Corollary 1 implies $\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant \sum_{ij \in E} y_{ij}$, and it is sufficient to show that $\boldsymbol{y}$ is an optimal solution for the LP defining $\mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$:

$$\text{Minimize } \sum_{ij \in E} y_{ij} \text{ subject to the McCormick inequalities and (14)–(16).}$$

Our argument will be based on expressing $\sum_{ij \in E} y_{ij}$ in terms of the variables x_i and then arguing the McCormick inequalities and (14)–(16) imply that this expression is actually a lower bound for $\mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$. The following observations turn out to be useful.

- During the runtime of the algorithm the parameter b is never decreasing.
- After every step of Algorithm 1 there is an integer s such that

$$|\{i \ : \ t \in X_i\}| = \begin{cases} s+2 & \text{for } t < a, \\ s+1 & \text{for } a \leqslant t < b, \\ s & \text{for } b \leqslant t < 1 \end{cases}$$

  if $b < 1$, and

$$|\{i \ : \ t \in X_i\}| = \begin{cases} s+1 & \text{for } t < a, \\ s & \text{for } a \leqslant t < 1, \end{cases}$$

if $b = 1$.

- If $b = 1$ at termination of the algorithm, and s is the integer with $|\{i : t \in X_i\}| = s$ for $t \in [a, 1)$ then $a = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_n - s$ and $b = x_{s+1} + x_{s+2} + \cdots + x_{n-1}$.
- If $b < 1$ at termination of the algorithm, and s is the integer with $|\{i : t \in X_i\}| = s$ for $t \in [b, 1)$ then $a = x_1 + x_2 + \cdots + x_s + x_n - s$ and $b = x_{s+1} + x_{s+2} + \cdots + x_{n-1}$.

Case 1. $b = 1$. If $a \leqslant x_n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{ij\in E} y_{ij} &= a\left[\binom{s+1}{2} - 1\right] + (x_n - a)\left[\binom{s}{2} - 1\right] + (1 - x_n)\binom{s}{2} \\ &= as - x_n + \binom{s}{2} = (x_1 + \cdots + x_n - s)s - x_n + \binom{s}{2} \\ &= s(x_1 + \cdots + x_n) - x_n - \binom{s+1}{2} \\ &\leqslant sx(V) - y_{n,n-1} - \binom{s+1}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if $a > x_n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{ij\in E} y_{ij} &= x_n\left[\binom{s+1}{2} - 1\right] + (a - x_n)\binom{s+1}{2} + (1 - a)\binom{s}{2} \\ &= as - x_n + \binom{s}{2} = s(x_1 + \cdots + x_n) - x_n - \binom{s+1}{2} \\ &\leqslant sx(V) - y_{n,n-1} - \binom{s+1}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

In both situations, (16) implies that $\mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{ij\in E} y_{ij}$, as required.

Case 2. $b < 1$. In this case we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{ij\in E} y_{ij} &= a\left[\binom{s+2}{2} - 1\right] + (x_n - a)\left[\binom{s+1}{2} - 1\right] + (b - x_n)\binom{s+1}{2} + (1 - b)\binom{s}{2} \\ &= a(s+1) - x_n + bs + \binom{s}{2} \\ &= (x_1 + \cdots + x_s + x_n - s)(s+1) - x_n + (x_{s+1} + \cdots + x_{n-1})s + \binom{s}{2} \\ &= s(x_1 + \cdots + x_{n-1}) + sx_n + (x_1 + \cdots + x_s) - s - \binom{s+1}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Using (14) and the McCormick inequalities for the edges $\{i, n\}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, s)$ we can verify that this is indeed a lower bound for $\mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{ij\in E} y_{ij} \geqslant \sum_{ij\in E\{1,\ldots,n-1\}} y_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{s} y_{in} &\geqslant s(x_1 + \cdots + x_{n-1}) - \binom{s+1}{2} + \sum_{i=1}^{s}(x_i + x_n - 1) \\ &= s(x_1 + \cdots + x_{n-1}) + sx_n + (x_1 + \cdots + x_s) - s - \binom{s+1}{2}.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we prove that each of the $3n - 9$ inequalities (14)–(16) is necessary. First, consider con-

straint (14) for some $s \in \{1, \dots, n-3\}$, and put

$$x_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant s-1, \\ 4/5 & \text{for } i = s, \\ 1/5 & \text{for } i = s+1, \\ 3/5 & \text{for } i = n-1, \\ 2/5 & \text{for } i = n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For $(\boldsymbol{x}, z) \in X(f)$, constraint (14) together with the McCormick inequalities

$$y_{in} \geqslant x_i + x_n - 1 = \begin{cases} 2/5 & \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant s-1, \\ 1/5 & \text{for } i = s \end{cases}$$

gives

$$\begin{aligned} z = y(E(\{1, \dots, n-1\})) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} y_{in} &\geqslant sx(\{1, \dots, n-1\}) - \frac{s(s+1)}{2} + \frac{2}{5}(s-1) + \frac{1}{5} \\ &= s\left(s + \frac{3}{5}\right) - \frac{s^2}{2} - \frac{s}{10} - \frac{1}{5} = \frac{s(s+1)}{2} - \frac{1}{5}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we set

$$y_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } 1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant s-1, \\ 4/5 & \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant s-1,\ j = s, \\ 1/5 & \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant s-1,\ j = s+1, \\ 3/5 & \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant s,\ j = n-1, \\ 2/5 & \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant s-1,\ j = n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then $\pi[f](\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) = \left(\boldsymbol{x}, \frac{s(s+1)}{2} - \frac{2}{5}\right) \notin X(f)$, but one can check that $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ satisfies all constraints of P except constraint (14) for the chosen value of s. In particular, it satisfies (16) because

$$sx(V) - x_n - \frac{s(s+1)}{2} = s(s+1) - \frac{2}{5} - \frac{s(s+1)}{2} = \frac{s(s+1)}{2} - \frac{2}{5}.$$

For constraint (15), we just exchange the roles of x_n and x_{n-1}.

Next, consider constraint (16) for some $s \in \{2, \dots, n-2\}$. We set $x_i = s/(n-1)$ for $1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1$ and $x_n = (s-1)/(n-1)$. The corresponding vector $\boldsymbol{y}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} y_{ij} &= \frac{s(s-1)}{(n-1)(n-2)} && \text{for } 1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n-1, \\ y_{in} &= \frac{\max\{0, 2s-n\}}{n-1} && \text{for } 1 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1. \end{aligned}$$

Then $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ satisfies all constraints of P except constraint (16) for the chosen value of s, since on the one hand,

$$y(E) + y_{n-1,n} = \binom{n-1}{2} \frac{s(s-1)}{(n-1)(n-2)} + (n-1)\frac{\max\{0, 2s-n\}}{n-1} = \frac{s(s-1)}{2} + \max\{0, 2s-n\},$$

and on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} sx(V) - \frac{s(s+1)}{2} &= sx(\{1, \dots, n-1\}) + (s-1)x_n - \frac{s(s+1)}{2} \\ &= s^2 + \frac{(s-1)^2}{n-1} - \frac{s(s+1)}{2} = \frac{s(s-1)}{2} + \frac{(s-1)^2}{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now $s(s-1) > \max\{0, 2s-n\}$, and this shows that $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ violates (16).

2.3.4 Proof of Theorem 2

We will establish this result by proving $\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant \mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$. Without loss of generality we assume $x_1 \leqslant x_2$ and $x_3 \geqslant x_4 \geqslant \cdots \geqslant x_n$, and we proceed as follows. We start with putting $X_k = [0, x_k)$ for $k \in \{3, \ldots, n\}$, and $X_1 = [1 - x_1, 1)$. For X_2 we consider three cases. In each case we will write down the set X_2, put $y_{ij} = \|X_i \cap X_j\|$ for all edges $ij \in E$, and argue that this vector $\boldsymbol{y}$ is optimal for the minimum characterization of $\mathrm{LB}_R[f](\boldsymbol{x})$, hence

$$\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant \sum_{ij \in E} \|X_i \cap X_j\| = \mathrm{LB}_R[f](\boldsymbol{x}).$$

The optimality of $\boldsymbol{y}$ will be verified by exhibiting a dual solution. We have that $\mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ is the optimal value for the problem

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Minimize } \sum_{ij \in E} y_{ij} \quad &\text{subject to} \\
y_{ij} &\geqslant x_i + x_j - 1 && \text{for all } ij \in E, \\
y_{12} + y_{1k} + y_{2k} &\geqslant x_1 + x_2 + x_k - 1 && \text{for all } k \in \{3, \ldots, n\} \\
y_{ij} &\geqslant 0 && \text{for all } ij \in E.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have relaxed the problem by omitting the constraints $y_{ij} \leqslant x_i$ and $y_{ij} \leqslant x_j$. If $\boldsymbol{y}$ is optimal for the relaxed problem then it is also optimal for the actual problem. The dual is

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Maximize } \sum_{ij \in E} (x_i + x_j - 1) z_{ij} + \sum_{k=3}^{n} (x_1 + x_2 + x_k - 1) w_k \quad &\text{subject to} \\
z_{12} + \sum_{k=3}^{n} w_k &\leqslant 1, \\
z_{ik} + w_k &\leqslant 1 \quad \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\},\ k \in \{3, \ldots, n\}, \\
z_{ij},\ w_k &\geqslant 0 \quad \text{for } ij \in E,\ k \in \{3, \ldots, n\}.
\end{aligned}$$



Case 1: $\boldsymbol{x} = (0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.4, 0.2)$ Case 2: $\boldsymbol{x} = (0.3, 0.7, 0.5, 0.4, 0.2)$

Figure 8: Illustrations for Cases 1 and 2 in the proof of Theorem 2.

Case 1. If $x_3 \leqslant 1 - x_2$, then $X_2 = [x_3, x_3 + x_2)$. We get $y_{12} + y_{23} + y_{13} = \max\{0, x_1 + x_2 + x_3 - 1\}$, $y_{1k} = y_{2k} = 0$ for all $k \geqslant 4$ (illustrated in Figure 8). The corresponding dual solution is $\boldsymbol{z} = \boldsymbol{0}$, $w_4 = \cdots = w_n = 0$, $w_3 = 1$ if $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 > 1$ and $w_3 = 0$ otherwise.

Case 2. If $1 - x_2 < x_3 \leqslant 1 - x_1$, then $X_2 = [1 - x_2, 1)$. We get $y_{12} + y_{23} + y_{13} = x_1 + x_2 + x_3 - 1$, and for all $k \geqslant 4$, $y_{1k} = 0$ and $y_{2k} = \max\{0, x_2 + x_k - 1\}$ (illustrated in Figure 8). The corresponding dual solution is given by $w_3 = 1$, $w_k = 0$ for $k \geqslant 4$, $z_{1k} = 0$ for all $k \in \{2, 3, \ldots, n\}$, and

$$z_{2k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_2 + x_k > 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } x_2 + x_k \leqslant 1. \end{cases}$$

for $k \in \{4, \ldots, n\}$.

Case 3. If $x_3 > 1 - x_1$ and $x_n \leqslant 2 - (x_1 + x_2 + x_{n-1})$, we set

$$i^* = \min\{i \ : \ 3 \leqslant i \leqslant n-1,\, x_{i+1} \leqslant 2 - (x_1 + x_2 + x_i)\},$$

and

$$X_2 = \begin{cases} [x_{i^*-1}, 1) \cup [x_{i^*}, x_{i^*} + x_2 + x_{i^*-1} - 1) & \text{if } x_{i^*} < 1 - x_2, \\ [1 - x_2, 1) & \text{if } 1 - x_2 \leqslant x_{i^*} \leqslant 1 - x_1, \\ [x_{i^*}, 1) \cup [2 - (x_1 + x_2 + x_{i^*}), 1 - x_1) & \text{if } x_{i^*} > 1 - x_1. \end{cases}$$

See Figure 9 for an illustration. This yields

- $y_{12} + y_{1i^*} + y_{2i^*} = x_1 + x_2 + x_{i^*} - 1$,
- $y_{1k} = y_{2k} = 0$ for all $k > i^*$, and
- $y_{ik} = \max\{0, x_i + x_k - 1\}$ for all $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $3 \leqslant k < i^*$.



Figure 9: Illustrations for Case 3 (with $i^* = 4$) in the proof of Theorem 2.

The corresponding dual solution is given by $z_{12} = 0$,

$$w_k = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = i^* \\ 0 & \text{if } k \neq i^* \end{cases} \qquad \text{for } k \in \{3, \ldots, n\},$$

$$z_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_i + x_k \geqslant 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } x_i + x_k \geqslant 1 \end{cases} \qquad \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\},\, k \in \{3, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i^*\}.$$

Case 4. If $2 - (x_1 + x_2 + x_{n-1}) < x_n \leqslant 2 - (x_1 + x_2)$ then

$$X_2 = \begin{cases} [x_n, 1 - x_1) \cup [2 - (x_1 + x_2 + x_n), 1) & \text{if } x_2 + x_n \leqslant 1 \\ [1 - x_2, 1) & \text{if } x_1 + x_n \leqslant 1 < x_2 + x_n, \\ [x_n, 1) \cup [0, x_2 + x_n - 1) & \text{if } 1 < x_1 + x_n \leqslant 2 - x_2. \end{cases}$$

This gives $y_{12} + y_{1n} + y_{2n} = x_1 + x_2 + x_n + 1$ and $y_{ik} = \max\{0, x_i + x_k - 1\}$ for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $k \in \{3, \ldots, n-1\}$ (see Figure 10).



Figure 10: Illustrations for Case 4 in the proof of Theorem 2.

The corresponding dual solution is given by

$$w_k = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = i^* \\ 0 & \text{if } k \neq i^* \end{cases} \qquad \text{for } k \in \{3, \dots, n\},$$

$$z_{ik} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_i + x_k \geqslant 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } x_i + x_k < 1 \end{cases} \qquad \text{for } i \in \{1, 2\},\ k \in \{3, \dots, n\} \setminus \{i^*\}.$$

Case 5. If $x_1 + x_2 + x_n > 2$, then $X_2 = [0, 1 - x_1) \cup [2 - x_1 - x_2, 1)$. Then $y_{ij} = x_i + x_j - 1$ for all edges $ij \in E$ (see Figure 11), and the corresponding dual solution is $w_k = 0$ for all k, and $z_{ij} = 1$ for all $ij \in E$.



Figure 11: Illustration for Case 5 in the proof of Theorem 2.

Finally, each of the $n-2$ inequalities in (17) is necessary, because the inequality $x_1 + x_2 + x_k - y_{12} - y_{1k} - y_{2k} \leqslant 1$ is needed to cut off the point $(\boldsymbol{x}, 0)$ with $x_1 = x_2 = x_k = 1/2$ and $x_i = 0$ for all $i \notin \{1, 2, k\}$.

2.3.5 Proof of Theorem 3

Throughout all indices are in $[n]$ and have to be read modulo n in the obvious way. The n-cycle corresponds to the function

$$f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i x_i x_{i+1}.$$

Let $P \subseteq [0,1]^{2n}$ be the polytope described by the McCormick inequalities together with (19) and (20). We claim that $\pi[f](P) = X(f)$, and that (19) (resp. (20)) can be omitted if $|E^-|$ (resp. $|E^+|$) is even.

We need to show that for every $\boldsymbol{x} \in [0,1]^n$ we have $\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ and $\mathrm{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{UB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$. We present the argument for $\mathrm{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{UB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ in detail, as $\mathrm{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ can be proved similarly. We fix $\boldsymbol{x} \in [0,1]^n$ and put

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_i &= \min\{x_i, x_{i+1}\}, \\ \eta_i &= \max\{0, x_i + x_{i+1} - 1\}, \\ A &= x(V^+) - x(V^-) + \left\lfloor \frac{|E^-|}{2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\mathrm{UB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \max\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i y_i \ :\ \eta_i \leqslant y_i \leqslant \mu_i,\ y(E^+) - y(E^-) \leqslant A \right\} \tag{25}$$

$$= \min\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\mu_i z_i - \eta_i w_i) + A\alpha \ :\ z_i - w_i + \alpha \geqslant a_i \text{ for } i \in E^+, \right.$$

$$\left. z_i - w_i - \alpha \geqslant a_i \text{ for } i \in E^-,\ z_i, w_i, \alpha \geqslant 0 \right\}. \tag{26}$$

W.l.o.g. we assume $|a_n| \leqslant |a_i|$ for all $i \in [n]$, and we define sets $X_i \subseteq [0,1)$ as follows. Let $X_1 = [0, x_1)$ and

$$X_2 = \begin{cases} [0, x_2) & \text{if } a_1 > 0, \\ [1 - x_2, 1) & \text{if } a_1 < 0. \end{cases}$$

For $i \geqslant 3$ we set $E_i^- = \{j \ : \ i \leqslant j \leqslant n, \ a_j < 0\}$ and define X_i depending on the parity of $|E_i^-|$ and the sign of a_{i-1}. Intuitively, we can think of filling a bucket of capacity x_i from the reservoirs $R_1 = X_{i-1} \setminus X_1$, $R_2 = X_{i-1} \cap X_1$, $R_3 = [0,1) \setminus (X_1 \cup X_{i-1})$ and $R_4 = X_1 \setminus X_{i-1}$, and there are two objectives:

1. If $a_{i-1} > 0$ we want to maximize $\|X_{i-1} \cap X_i\|$, so the reservoirs R_1 and R_2 are used before R_3 and R_4. If $a_{i-1} < 0$ then we want to minimize $\|X_{i-1} \cap X_i\|$, so R_3 and R_4 are used before R_1 and R_2.
2. If $|E_i^-|$ is odd we want to minimize $\|X_1 \cap X_i\|$, so R_1 is used before R_2 and R_3 before R_4. If $|E_i^-|$ is even we want to maximize $\|X_1 \cap X_i\|$, so R_2 is used before R_1 and R_4 before R_3.

Algorithm 2 `Bucket`(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4, x)

Input: A partition $[0,1) = Y_1 \cup Y_2 \cup Y_3 \cup Y_4$ (with $Y_k \in \mathcal{L}$) and capacity $x \in [0,1]$

Initialize $X \leftarrow \emptyset$ and $k \leftarrow 1$
while $\|X\| < x$ **do**
  Let $Z \in \mathcal{L}$ be a subset of Y_k with $\|Z\| = \min\{\|Y_k\|, x - \|X\|\}$
  $X \leftarrow X \cup Z$
  $k \leftarrow k + 1$

Output: $X \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\|X\| = x$

More formally,

$$X_i = \begin{cases} \texttt{Bucket}(R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4, x_i) & \text{if } a_{i-1} > 0 \text{ and } |E_i^-| \text{ odd}, \\ \texttt{Bucket}(R_2, R_1, R_4, R_3, x_i) & \text{if } a_{i-1} > 0 \text{ and } |E_i^-| \text{ even}, \\ \texttt{Bucket}(R_3, R_4, R_1, R_2, x_i) & \text{if } a_{i-1} < 0 \text{ and } |E_i^-| \text{ odd}, \\ \texttt{Bucket}(R_4, R_3, R_2, R_1, x_i) & \text{if } a_{i-1} < 0 \text{ and } |E_i^-| \text{ even}. \end{cases}$$

where the function `Bucket` is described in Algorithm 2. Note that this corresponds to a solution with

$$y_i = \|X_i \cap X_{i+1}\| = \begin{cases} \mu_i & \text{for } i \in E^+ \setminus \{n\}, \\ \eta_i & \text{for } i \in E^- \setminus \{n\}. \end{cases}$$

Example 3. The construction is illustrated in Figure 12, and with $|a_i| = 1$ for all i the corresponding objective value is 2.3 and we conclude $\mathrm{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{UB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = 2.3$ because (19) becomes

$$x(V^-) - x(V^+) + y(E^+) - y(E^-) = 0.4 - 1.7 + f(\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant \left\lfloor \frac{|E^-|}{2} \right\rfloor = 1.$$

Next we define the *defects*

$$\delta_i = \begin{cases} \|X_1 \cap X_i\| - \max\{0, x_1 + x_i - 1\} & \text{if } |E_i^-| \text{ is odd}, \\ \min\{x_i, x_1\} - \|X_1 \cap X_i\| & \text{if } |E_i^-| \text{ is even}. \end{cases}$$

We have $\delta_i \geqslant 0$ for all i and

$$\mathrm{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \|X_i \cap X_{i+1}\| = \sum_{i \in E^+} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{i \in E^-} a_i \eta_i - |a_n| \delta_n,$$

so in order to complete the proof of the claim $\mathrm{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \mathrm{UB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ it is sufficient to prove

$$\mathrm{UB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \leqslant \sum_{i \in E^+} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{i \in E^-} a_i \eta_i - |a_n| \delta_n. \tag{27}$$



Figure 12: Constructing the sets X_i, where the edge labels indicate the sign of the coefficient a_i.

If $\delta_n = 0$ then this follows immediately from the McCormick inequalities which imply

$$a_i y_i \leqslant \begin{cases} a_i \mu_i & \text{for } i \in E^+, \\ a_i \eta_i & \text{for } i \in E^-. \end{cases}$$

For $\delta_n > 0$ the claim is a consequence of the following lemma.

Lemma 2. *If $\delta_n > 0$ then $\delta_n = \sum_{i \in E^+} \mu_i - \sum_{i \in E^-} \eta_i - A$.*

Using Lemma 2, we can prove inequality (27) by LP duality. If $a_n > 0$ we define a solution for the dual problem (26) by $\alpha = a_n$ and (using the assumption that $|a_n| \leqslant |a_i|$ for all i)

$$z_i = \begin{cases} a_i - a_n & \text{for } i \in E^+, \\ 0 & \text{for } i \in E^-, \end{cases} \qquad w_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } i \in E^+, \\ -a_i - a_n & \text{for } i \in E^-. \end{cases}$$

This is a feasible solution for (26) with objective value

$$\sum_{i \in E^+} \mu_i (a_i - a_n) + \sum_{i \in E^-} \eta_i (a_i + a_n) + A a_n = \sum_{i \in E^+} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{i \in E^-} a_i \eta_i + a_n \left(A - \sum_{i \in E^+} \mu_i + \sum_{i \in E^-} \eta_i \right)$$
$$= \sum_{i \in E^+} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{i \in E^-} a_i \eta_i - a_n \delta_n.$$

Similarly, for $a_n < 0$ we define a solution for the dual problem (26) by $\alpha = -a_n$ and

$$z_i = \begin{cases} a_i + a_n & \text{for } i \in E^+, \\ 0 & \text{for } i \in E^-, \end{cases} \qquad w_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } i \in E^+, \\ a_n - a_i & \text{for } i \in E^-. \end{cases}$$

with objective value

$$\sum_{i \in E^+} \mu_i (a_i + a_n) + \sum_{i \in E^-} \eta_i (a_i - a_n) - A a_n = \sum_{i \in E^+} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{i \in E^-} a_i \eta_i + a_n \left(\sum_{i \in E^+} \mu_i - \sum_{i \in E^-} \eta_i - A \right)$$
$$= \sum_{i \in E^+} a_i \mu_i + \sum_{i \in E^-} a_i \eta_i + a_n \delta_n.$$

Before proving Lemma 2 we show that the sequence $(\delta_i)_{i=2,\ldots,n}$ is decreasing, and therefore in the proof of Lemma 2 we may assume $\delta_i > 0$ for all i.

Lemma 3. *For all $i \in \{3, \dots, n\}$ we have $\delta_i \leqslant \delta_{i-1}$.*

Proof. We check the following implications.

1. $|E_{i-1}|$ odd, $a_{i-1} > 0 \implies \delta_i = \delta_{i-1} - \begin{cases} \max\{0,\, x_{i-1} - x_i,\, (x_1 + x_i - 1)\} & \text{if } x_1 + x_{i-1} \leqslant 1, \\ \max\{0,\, 1 - x_1 - x_i,\, x_i - x_{i-1}\} & \text{if } x_1 + x_{i-1} \geqslant 1. \end{cases}$

2. $|E_{i-1}|$ odd, $a_{i-1} < 0 \implies \delta_i = \delta_{i-1} - \begin{cases} \max\{0,\, x_1 - x_i,\, (x_{i-1} + x_i - 1)\} & \text{if } x_1 + x_{i-1} \leqslant 1, \\ \max\{0,\, 1 - x_{i-1} - x_i,\, x_i - x_1\} & \text{if } x_1 + x_{i-1} \geqslant 1. \end{cases}$

3. $|E_{i-1}|$ even, $a_{i-1} > 0 \implies \delta_i = \delta_{i-1} - \begin{cases} \max\{0,\, x_{i-1} - x_i,\, (x_i - 1)\} & \text{if } x_{i-1} \leqslant x_1, \\ \max\{0,\, x_1 - x_i,\, x_i - x_{i-1}\} & \text{if } x_{i-1} \geqslant x_1. \end{cases}$

4. $|E_{i-1}|$ even, $a_{i-1} < 0 \implies \delta_i = \delta_{i-1} - \begin{cases} \max\{0,\, 1 - x_1 - x_i,\, x_{i-1} + x_i - 1\} & \text{if } x_{i-1} \leqslant x_1, \\ \max\{0,\, 1 - x_{i-1} - x_i,\, x_1 + x_i - 1\} & \text{if } x_{i-1} \geqslant x_1. \end{cases}$ □

Proof of Lemma 2. If $|E^-|$ is even then $\delta_2 = 0$, hence $\delta_i = 0$ for all i by Lemma 3, and there is nothing to do. For odd $|E^-|$ we proceed by induction on n. Note that the construction of the sets X_i, the definition of the numbers δ_i, and the statement of the lemma depend only on sequences $(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ (actually only on the signs of the a_i). Therefore we can use $n = 2$ as the base case. Then $|E^-| = 1$, $V^+ = V^- = \emptyset$, $A = 0$, and we have the following two cases.

Case 1: if $a_2 < 0 < a_1$, then $\|X_1 \cap X_2\| = \min\{x_1, x_2\}$ and

$$\delta_2 = \|X_1 \cap X_2\| - \max\{0, x_1 + x_2 - 1\} = \mu_1 - \eta_2.$$

Case 2: if $a_1 < 0 < a_2$, then $\|X_1 \cap X_2\| = \max\{0, x_1 + x_2 - 1\}$ and

$$\delta_2 = \min\{x_1, x_2\} - \|X_1 \cap X_2\| = \mu_2 - \eta_1.$$

Now let $n \geqslant 3$ and set

$$\gamma = \sum_{i \in E^+} \mu_i - \sum_{i \in E^-} \eta_i - A = \sum_{i \in E^+} \mu_i - \sum_{i \in E^-} \eta_i - x(V^+) + x(V^-) - \left\lfloor \frac{|E^-|}{2} \right\rfloor,$$

so that our aim becomes to show $\delta_n = \gamma$. Applying the induction hypothesis to the sets $X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}$ obtained by applying the construction for the sequences $(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_{n-2}, \operatorname{sign}(a_{n-1}a_n))$ (the number of negative terms is still odd) we get

$$\delta_{n-1} = \begin{cases} \gamma - \mu_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_n + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} & \text{if } n-1, n \in E^+, \\ \gamma + \eta_{n-1} + \eta_n - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} + 1 & \text{if } n-1, n \in E^-, \\ \gamma - \mu_{n-1} + \eta_n + x_{n-1} - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} & \text{if } n-1 \in E^+,\, n \in E^-, \\ \gamma + \eta_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_1 - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} & \text{if } n-1 \in E^-,\, n \in E^+. \end{cases}$$

Now we discuss the four cases separately. The detailed case analysis can be found in Appendix A.

Case 1: $n-1, n \in E^+$. We may assume $\|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\| < x_n < x_1 + x_{n-1} - \|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\|$ since otherwise $\delta_n = 0$.

Case 1.1: $x_{n-1} \leqslant x_1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\|$.

Case 1.2: $x_{n-1} > x_1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_1 \setminus X_{n-1}\|$.

Case 2: $n-1, n \in E^-$. We may assume $1 - \|X_1 \cup X_{n-1}\| < x_n < 1 - \|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\|$ since otherwise $\delta_n = 0$.

Case 2.1: $x_{n-1} \leqslant x_1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\| = \|X_1 \cup X_{n-1}\| - x_1$.

Case 2.2: $x_{n-1} > x_1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_1 \setminus X_{n-1}\| = \|X_1 \cup X_{n-1}\| - x_{n-1}$.

Case 3: $n-1 \in E^+$, $n \in E^-$. We may assume $\|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\| < x_n < 1 - \|X_1 \setminus X_{n-1}\|$ since otherwise $\delta_n = 0$.

Case 3.1: $x_1 + x_{n-1} \leqslant 1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\|$.

Case 3.2: $x_1 + x_{n-1} > 1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|[0,1) \setminus (X_1 \cup X_{n-1})\|$.

Case 4: $n-1 \in E^-$, $n \in E^+$. We may assume $\|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\| < x_n < 1 - \|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\|$ since otherwise $\delta_n = 0$.

Case 4.1: $x_1 + x_{n-1} \leqslant 1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\|$.

Case 4.2: $x_1 + x_{n-1} > 1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|[0,1) \setminus (X_1 \cup X_{n-1})\|$. □

3 Computational study

In this section, we study which of the Padberg inequalities give the strongest relaxation of the convex hull of the graph of a bilinear function. Results 1–6 are valid inequalities for the boolean quadric polytope QP and its linear (continuous) relaxation M, i.e., they are valid for a complete graph G. In this section, we apply the Padberg inequalities only to complete subgraphs of an arbitrary graph G. Note that in Padberg's paper [16], clique, cut, generalized cut, and odd cycle inequalities all intersect with triangle inequalities (since a triangle is both a clique and a cycle, see also Figure 1). To better differentiate between these classes of inequalities, in this section, cliques and cycles start with cardinality 4, and (generalized) cut inequalities start with $|S| \geqslant 1$, $|T| \geqslant 2$, and $|S| + |T| \geqslant 4$. This leads us to define the following classes of valid inequalities for arbitrary graphs:

Definition 3 (Classes of valid inequalities for arbitrary graphs)**.** Let $G = (V, E)$ be an arbitrary graph. Then the following inequalities are valid:

i. *McCormick inequalities* (1)–(4) for every edge $ij \in E$.

ii. *Triangle inequalities* (5)–(8) for every $T = \{i, j, k\} \subseteq V$ that forms a triangle in G.

iii. *Clique inequalities* (9) for every $S \subseteq Q$ with $|S| \geqslant 3$ and integer α, $1 \leqslant \alpha \leqslant |S| - 2$, where $Q \subseteq V$ with $|Q| \geqslant 4$ forms a clique in G.

iv. *Cut inequalities* (10) for every $S \subseteq Q$ with $|S| \geqslant 1$ and $T \subseteq Q \setminus S$ with $|T| \geqslant 2$ and $|S| + |T| \geqslant 4$, where $Q \subseteq V$ with $|Q| \geqslant 4$ forms a clique in G.

v. *Generalized cut inequalities* (11) for every $S \subseteq Q$ with $s = |S| \geqslant 1$ and $T \subseteq Q \setminus S$ with $t = |T| \geqslant 2$ and $|S| + |T| \geqslant 4$, where $Q \subseteq V$ with $|Q| \geqslant 4$ forms a clique in G.

vi. *Odd cycle inequalities* (19)–(20) for every cycle C_k in G with $k \geqslant 4$.

Let MT (resp. MQ, MC, MG, and MO) denote the set of points $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ satisfying the McCormick and triangle inequalities, i.e., Definition 3 i. and ii. (resp. McCormick and clique [i. and iii.], McCormick and cut [i. and iv.], McCormick and generalized cut [i. and v.], and McCormick and odd cycle [i. and vi.]). For any $k \geqslant 4$, let MQ_k (resp. MC_k, MG_k, and MO_k) be the set of points $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y})$ satisfying the McCormick and clique inequalities (resp. cut, generalized cut, and odd cycle inequalities) for cliques resp. cycles of cardinality k. Note that adding the triangle, clique, cut, generalized cut, and odd cycle inequalities without the McCormick inequalities does not ensure the set of points to be bounded, i.e., to be a polytope. Now all classes of inequalities in Definition 3 i.–vi. are disjoint, except for some cut and generalized cut inequalities.

In the remainder of this section, we study which of Padberg's inequalities are strongest. After giving details of the implementation (Section 3.1) and introducing some additional notation (Section 3.2), we apply Padberg's inequalities individually to small random graphs (Section 3.3), making the observation that triangle inequalities appear to be strongest. Finally, in Section 3.4, we relax (quadratically constrained) quadratic programs ([QC]QPs) from the literature using McCormick and triangle inequalities. We compare both linear and convex relaxations with respect to their relaxation strengths and solution times. Solving such strong relaxations fast is a key ingredient of today's global optimization solvers.

3.1 Implementation

All our computations were carried out on a Dell PowerEdge R710 with dual hex core 3.06 GHz Intel Xeon X5675 processors and 96 GB RAM, running Red Hat Enterprise Linux 6 and using a single thread. In Section 3.3, we used the Python package `NetworkX` [8] (version 1.10, networkx.github.io) to enumerate all cliques and cycles of small graphs. More specifically, we used the `enumerate_all_cliques(G)` and `simple_cycles(H)` functions, where `G` is an undirected and `H` is a directed graph. To convert `G` to `H`, we used the `to_directed()` function. For large graphs, it is possible to enumerate $c \leqslant c_{\max}$ cliques of size $k_{\min} \leqslant k \leqslant k_{\max}$ using the set of C routines `Cliquer` [15] (version 1.21, users.aalto.fi/~pat/cliquer.html), and, more specifically, its `clique_unweighted_find_all(...)` function. For example, `Cliquer` enumerates all $\binom{1000}{3} = 166,167,000$ triangles of K_{1000}, the complete graph on 1000 vertices, in 6 minutes. We solved all (mixed integer) linear programs ([MI]LPs) as well as all convex (quadratically constrained) quadratic programs ([QC]QPs) in Sections 3.3–3.4 with `CPLEX` 12.6.2.0 (cplex.com).

3.2 Notation

For a function $f = \sum_{ij \in E} a_{ij} x_i x_j$ and a given point $\boldsymbol{x} \in [0,1]^n$, we define the gaps

$$\operatorname{gap}_X[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \operatorname{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) - \operatorname{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \operatorname{gap}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \operatorname{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) - \operatorname{LB}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}),$$

where P is a polytope. The following inequalities hold:

$$\operatorname{gap}_X \;\leqslant\; \operatorname{gap}_{MT}, \operatorname{gap}_{MQ}, \operatorname{gap}_{MC}, \operatorname{gap}_{MG}, \operatorname{gap}_{MO} \;\leqslant\; \operatorname{gap}_M\,.$$

For a given $\boldsymbol{x}$, $\operatorname{vex}[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ can be calculated by solving the linear program [11]

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \left\{ \sum_{k \in [2^n]} \lambda^k \sum_{ij \in E} a_{ij} \xi_i^k \xi_j^k \;:\; \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \Delta^{2^n},\; \boldsymbol{x} = \sum_{k \in [2^n]} \lambda^k \boldsymbol{\xi}^k \right\}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}^k$, $k \in [2^n]$, are the vertices of $[0,1]^n$ (set e.g. $\xi_i^k = \lceil k/2^{n-i} \rceil \mod 2$ for all $i \in V$, $k \in [2^n]$) and Δ^{2^n} is the 2^n-simplex. Similarly, $\operatorname{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ can be calculated by replacing the minimum by a maximum. Recall from Result 7 that if all edges are positive, then $\operatorname{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x})$ can be calculated more efficiently using $\operatorname{cav}[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{ij \in E} a_{ij} \min\{x_i, x_j\}$. As in [11], we compare a polytope P to $X(f)$ by calculating the ratio

$$\Delta_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}) = \frac{\operatorname{gap}_P[f](\boldsymbol{x})}{\operatorname{gap}_X[f](\boldsymbol{x})} \geqslant 1$$

for a given $\boldsymbol{x}$. In [11], the functions $\operatorname{gap}_X[f]$ and $\operatorname{gap}_M[f]$ are called $\operatorname{chgap}[f]$ and $\operatorname{mcgap}[f]$, respectively.

3.3 Random graphs

We first define the class of random graphs on which we run our experiments.

Definition 4 (Random graphs)**.** Let $G(n,p)$ be the Erdős-Rényi random graph, i.e., the graph with vertex set $V = [n]$ in which the edges are chosen independently and with probability $p \in (0,1)$.

For each edge $ij \in E$, we assume independent normally distributed coefficients $a_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Let $I = \{\boldsymbol{x}^1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}^{|I|}\} \subseteq [0,1]^n$ be a set of sample points and $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of functions. By $\mu_P[f]$ we denote the mean and the standard deviation of all $\Delta_P[f](\boldsymbol{x}^i)$, $i \in I$, for a polytope P and a function $f \in \mathcal{F}$. Similarly, let μ_P and σ_P denote the mean and the standard deviation of all $\mu_P[f]$, $f \in \mathcal{F}$, for a polytope P. We ran our experiments on $|I| = 100$ sample points and $|\mathcal{F}| = 100$ randomly generated graphs, using `NetworkX` to enumerate all cliques and cycles. We calculated μ_P and σ_P for the following (n,p)-pairs:

- $n = 10$, $p \in \{0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$,
- $n = 15$, $p \in \{0.2, 0.3\}$.



Figure 13: Error bars for $(\mu_P - 1, \sigma_P)$ [%] for $G(10, 0.8)$ with $|I| = 100$ sample points and $|\mathcal{F}| = 100$ randomly generated graphs.

There were no additional qualitative insights from considering smaller step sizes for n and p.

The error bars for $(\mu_P - 1, \sigma_P)$ for $G(10, 0.8)$ are shown in Figure 13. The detailed results for this and other experiments on random graphs can be found in Appendix B, Tables 3–5. In these figures and tables, c_P denotes the average number of edges in a graph if $P = M$, of triangles if $P = MT$, of all cliques if $P \in \{MQ, MC, MG\}$, of k-cliques if $P \in \{MQ_k, MC_k, MG_k\}$, of all cycles if $P = MO$, and of k-cycles if $P = MO_k$. We leave it to the interested reader to study these results in detail. However, we must point out one observation: the triangle inequalities are significantly stronger than all other classes of inequalities. This motivates us to apply only the McCormick and triangle inequalities to the much larger graphs that appear in (quadratically constrained) quadratic programs [(QC)QPs].

3.4 On to QPs and QCQPs

As we observed in Section 3.3, the McCormick and triangle inequalities appear to be the strongest inequalities for arbitrary graphs. In this section, we linearize/convexify originally nonconvex QP and QCQP instances from the literature using McCormick and triangle inequalities to find good lower bounds fast.

Let $MT(\boldsymbol{Q})$ denote the set of points $(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}) \in [0,1]^{n(n+3)/2}$ ($\boldsymbol{x} \in [0,1]^n$ and $\boldsymbol{y} \in [0,1]^{n(n+1)/2}$ since the QP and QCQP graphs may contain loops) satisfying the McCormick and triangle inequalities for a quadratic function $f = \boldsymbol{x}^T \boldsymbol{Q} \boldsymbol{x}$. For the quadratic terms $x_i x_i$ (i.e., loops in the support graph of f), we simply apply the McCormick inequalities, and we apply the triangle inequalities only to the support graph of f without loops. For every $ij \in E$, we assume $y_{ij} = y_{ji}$, reducing $\boldsymbol{y}$ to at most dimension $n(n+1)/2$ for the complete graph with loops. We consider the 239 (QC)QPs from the GloMIQO 2.2 Test Suite. These instances can be downloaded in GAMS format from [13]. The instances consist of 104 QP and 135 QCQP instances.

The graphs we considered in Section 3.3 were small, hence we could use `NetworkX` to enumerate all cliques and cycles. The graphs of the (QC)QP instances, however, are generally much larger. In fact, with averages of 36.95 vertices and 577.27 edges across all 6233 graphs, the instances are too large to enumerate all cliques and cycles. However, even for the largest instances, enumerating all triangles can be done efficiently.

149 out of the 239 instances contain triangles (that is, at least one of the graphs corresponding to the objective function and/or the constraints contains triangles). The majority of instances (77 or 51.68%) have functions with at most $\binom{30}{3} = 4060$ triangles, and 141 (or 94.63%) have at most $\binom{100}{3} = 161,700$ triangles. Since today's optimization solvers can solve LPs with hundreds of thousands of constraints efficiently, we can expect to be able to add *all* McCormick and triangle inequalities for the majority of the QC(QP) instances and to solve the LPs efficiently.

All QP and QCQP instances are of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{([QC]QP)} \qquad \min_{x\in[0,1]^n} \; & f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{x}^T\boldsymbol{Q}^0\boldsymbol{x} + (\boldsymbol{c}^0)^T\boldsymbol{x} \\ \text{s.t.} \qquad & g^k(\boldsymbol{x}) = \boldsymbol{x}^T\boldsymbol{Q}^k\boldsymbol{x} + (\boldsymbol{c}^k)^T\boldsymbol{x} \leqslant b^k, \qquad \forall\, k \in K, \\ & s\,\boldsymbol{e}^T\boldsymbol{x} = s, \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where $s \in \{0,1\}$ is a binary parameter that actives the simplex constraint (28) (0 = inactive, 1 = active). We can now

1. linearize the objective f and, if $K \neq \emptyset$, the constraints g^k, making it a linear program:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{([QC]QP-L)} \qquad \min_{x,y} \; & f_L(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = \boldsymbol{Q}^0\boldsymbol{y} + (\boldsymbol{c}^0)^T\boldsymbol{x} \\ \text{s.t.} \qquad & g^k_L(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = \boldsymbol{Q}^k\boldsymbol{y} + (\boldsymbol{c}^k)^T\boldsymbol{x} \leqslant b^k, \qquad \forall\, k \in K, \\ & (\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in MT(\boldsymbol{Q}^k), \qquad \forall\, k \in K \cup \{0\}, \qquad (28), \end{aligned}$$

2. convexify the objective f and, if $K \neq \emptyset$, the constraints g^k in the same way as was done in [5, 9], making it a convex (quadratically constrained) quadratic program:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{([QC]QP-C)} \qquad \min_{x,y} \; & f_C(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = \sum_{\substack{i,j\in V:\\ i\neq j}} Q^0_{ij}y_{ij} + \sum_{\substack{i\in V:\\ Q^0_{ii}<0}} Q^0_{ii}y_{ii} + \sum_{\substack{i\in V:\\ Q^0_{ii}>0}} Q^0_{ii}x_i^2 + (\boldsymbol{c}^0)^T\boldsymbol{x} \\ \text{s.t.} \qquad & g^k_C(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = \sum_{\substack{i,j\in V:\\ i\neq j}} Q^k_{ij}y_{ij} + \sum_{\substack{i\in V:\\ Q^k_{ii}<0}} Q^k_{ii}y_{ii} + \sum_{\substack{i\in V:\\ Q^k_{ii}>0}} Q^k_{ii}x_i^2 + (\boldsymbol{c}^k)^T\boldsymbol{x} \leqslant b^k, \quad \forall\, k \in K, \\ & (\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) \in MT((Q^k_{ij})_{i,j\in V:\, i\neq j} + (Q^k_{ii})_{i\in V:\, Q_{ii}<0}), \qquad \forall\, k \in K \cup \{0\}, \qquad (28). \end{aligned}$$

3.4.1 QPs

For the 104 QP instances, we have $K = \emptyset$. The linear program (QP-L) and the convex quadratic program (QP-C) are solved with `CPLEX`. (QP-L) and (QP-C) are used to calculate lower bounds on f. Let f^* (resp. f^*_L, f^*_C) denote the optimal objective value of (QP) [resp. (QP-L), (QP-C)]. Then

$$f^*_L \;\leqslant\; f^*_C \;\leqslant\; f^*.$$

All 104 QP instances and graphs corresponding to $\boldsymbol{Q}^0$ contain triangles. For these instances, we solve (QP-L) and (QP-C) for several polytopes $P \subseteq MT(\boldsymbol{Q}^0)$, differing in the percentage of triangle inequalities added. For $0\%, 10\%, \ldots, 100\%$, we randomly sample from all triangles of a given instance. Figure 14 shows, across all 104 instances, the averages and standard deviations of the relative gaps between the best known lower bound (obtained from solving (QP-C) with all triangle inequalities added) and the lower bound obtained from solving (QP-L) and (QP-C) with $0\%, 10\%, \ldots, 100\%$ of all triangle inequalities added. These relative gaps, shown on the y_1-axis (left), are accompanied by the geometric means of the solve times, shown on the y_2-axis (right).

We can conclude from these results that the lower bounds obtained from solving (QP-C) are only marginally better than the ones obtained from solving (QP-L), however, the solve times are often significantly worse. The observation that the lower bounds differ only marginally is not surprising, considering that the only difference between the two programs is in $0 \leqslant |\{i \in V : Q_{ii} > 0\}| \leqslant n$ quadratic terms.

3.4.2 QCQP instances

For the 135 QCQP instances, we have $K \neq \emptyset$. (QCQP-L) and (QCQP-C) are solved with `CPLEX`. As before, (QCQP-L) and (QCQP-C) can be used to calculate lower bounds on f. Let f^* (resp. f^*_L, f^*_C) denote the optimal objective value of (QCQP) [resp. (QCQP-L), (QCQP-C)]. Then

$$f^*_L \;\leqslant\; f^*_C \;\leqslant\; f^*.$$

Figure 15 is similar to Figure 14 — and so are our conclusions: linear relaxations using McCormick and triangle inequalities are a good combination to obtain strong lower bounds fast.


average and standard deviation, relative gaps of lower bounds [%]
geometric mean, solve times [s]
triangle inequalities [%]
(QP-L)
(QP-C)

Figure 14: Relative gaps of lower bounds and geometric means of solve times for triangle inequalities [%], comparison of (QP-L) and (QP-C).


average and standard deviation, relative gaps of lower bounds [%]
geometric mean, solve times [s]
triangle inequalities [%]
(QCQP-L)
(QCQP-C)

Figure 15: Relative gaps of lower bounds and geometric means of solve times for triangle inequalities [%], comparison of (QCQP-L) and (QCQP-C).

4 Conclusion and future work

In this paper, we made both theoretical and computational contributions. On the theoretical side (Section 2), we proved that the McCormick inequalities together with the following inequalities fully characterize the convex hulls of graphs of bilinear functions $f(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_{1 \leqslant i < j \leqslant n} a_{ij} x_i x_j$ on the unit cube:

- for positive unit coefficients $a_{ij} = 1$ and the support graph of f being
  - cliques K_n, the $n-2$ inequalities in (13) are sufficient (see Result 9),
  - almost cliques K_n^-, the $3n-9$ inequalities (14)–(16) are sufficient (see Theorem 1),
  - triangular book graphs $K_{1,1,n-2}$, the $n-2$ inequalities in (17) are sufficient (see Theorem 2),
- for general coefficients $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ and the support graph of f being cycles C_n, the two inequalities (19)–(20) are sufficient (see Theorem 3).

Furthermore, we made the observation that clique and cycle inequalities are insufficient to fully characterize the convex hulls of chordal graphs.

On the computational side (Section 3), we saw that, for general coefficients, the triangle inequalities are significantly stronger than all other classes of inequalities (this has also been observed in [5]). Finally, we linearized and convexified originally nonconvex QP and QCQP instances from the literature using McCormick and triangle inequalities to find good lower bounds fast. We found that the linear programs provided only marginally worse lower bounds than the convex ones, but showed significantly better solve times — making linear relaxations using McCormick and triangle inequalities a good combination to obtain strong lower bounds fast for (QC)QPs.

In future research, we wish to investigate the following questions:

- Are there larger classes of bilinear functions where the McCormick relaxation and some of the Padberg inequalities fully characterize the convex hull?
- How can we alternatively measure the strength of inequalities?
- Can we dynamically generate strong cuts using only a small number of Padberg inequalities?

Acknowledgements This research was supported by the ARC Linkage Grant no. LP110200524, Hunter Valley Coal Chain Coordinator (hvccc.com.au) and Triple Point Technology (tpt.com).

A Detailed case analysis in the proof of Lemma 2

Case 1: $n-1, n \in E^+$. We may assume $\|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\| < x_n < x_1 + x_{n-1} - \|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\|$ since otherwise $\delta_n = 0$.

Case 1.1: $x_{n-1} \leqslant x_1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\|$.

If $x_n \leqslant x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n = \|X_n \setminus X_1\| &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_{n-1} - x_n)\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_n + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} - (x_{n-1} - x_n)\\ &= \gamma - x_n - x_n + x_n + x_{n-1} - (x_{n-1} - x_n) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

If $x_{n-1} \leqslant x_n \leqslant x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n = \|X_n \setminus X_1\| &= \delta_{n-1}\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_n + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\}\\ &= \gamma - x_{n-1} - x_n + x_n + x_{n-1} = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $x_n \geqslant x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n = \|X_1 \setminus X_n\| &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_n - x_1)\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_n + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} - (x_n - x_1)\\ &= \gamma - x_{n-1} - x_1 + x_n + x_{n-1} - (x_n - x_1) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Case 1.2: $x_{n-1} > x_1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_1 \setminus X_{n-1}\|$.

If $x_n \leqslant x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n = \|X_n \setminus X_1\| &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_1 - x_n)\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_n + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} - (x_1 - x_n)\\ &= \gamma - x_n - x_n + x_n + x_1 - (x_1 - x_n) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

If $x_1 \leqslant x_n \leqslant x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n = \|X_1 \setminus X_n\| &= \delta_{n-1}\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_n + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\}\\ &= \gamma - x_n - x_1 + x_n + x_1 = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $x_n \geqslant x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n = \|X_1 \setminus X_n\| &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_n - x_{n-1})\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_n + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} - (x_n - x_{n-1})\\ &= \gamma - x_{n-1} - x_1 + x_n + x_1 - (x_n - x_{n-1}) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $n-1, n \in E^-$. We may assume $1 - \|X_1 \cup X_{n-1}\| < x_n < 1 - \|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\|$ since otherwise $\delta_n = 0$.

Case 2.1: $x_{n-1} \leqslant x_1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\| = \|X_1 \cup X_{n-1}\| - x_1$.

If $x_n \leqslant 1 - x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n = \|X_n \cap X_1\| = x_n - (1 - \|X_1 \cup X_{n-1}\|) &= \delta_{n-1} - (1 - x_1 - x_n)\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} + \eta_n - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} + 1 - (1 - x_1 - x_n)\\ &= \gamma + 0 + 0 - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + x_{n-1} + 1 - (1 - x_1 - x_n) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

If $1 - x_1 \leqslant x_n \leqslant 1 - x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n = \|[0,1] \setminus (X_n \cup X_1)\| &= \|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\| = \delta_{n-1}\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} + \eta_n - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} + 1\\ &= \gamma + 0 + (x_n + x_1 - 1) - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + x_{n-1} + 1 = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $x_n \geqslant 1 - x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \|[0,1] \setminus (X_n \cup X_1)\| = \delta_{n-1} - (x_n + x_{n-1} - 1)\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} + \eta_n - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} + 1 - \eta_{n-1}\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} + (x_n + x_1 - 1) - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + x_{n-1} + 1 - \eta_{n-1} = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Case 2.2: $x_{n-1} > x_1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_1 \setminus X_{n-1}\| = \|X_1 \cup X_{n-1}\| - x_{n-1}$.
If $x_n \leqslant 1 - x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \|X_n \cap X_1\| = x_n - (1 - \|X_1 \cup X_{n-1}\|) = \delta_{n-1} - (1 - x_n - x_{n-1})\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} + \eta_n - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} + 1 - (1 - x_n - x_{n-1})\\ &= \gamma + 0 + 0 - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + x_1 + 1 - (1 - x_n - x_{n-1}) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

If $1 - x_{n-1} \leqslant x_n \leqslant 1 - x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \|X_n \cap X_1\| = \|X_1 \setminus X_{n-1}\| = \delta_{n-1}\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} + \eta_n - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} + 1\\ &= \gamma + (x_{n-1} + x_n - 1) + 0 - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + x_1 + 1 = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $x_n \geqslant 1 - x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \|[0,1] \setminus (X_n \cup X_1)\| = \delta_{n-1} - (x_n + x_1 - 1)\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} + \eta_n - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + \min\{x_{n-1},\, x_1\} + 1 - \eta_n\\ &= \gamma + (x_{n-1} + x_n - 1) + \eta_n - x_n - x_{n-1} - x_1 + x_1 + 1 - \eta_n = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Case 3: $n - 1 \in E^+$, $n \in E^-$. We may assume $\|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\| < x_n < 1 - \|X_1 \setminus X_{n-1}\|$ since otherwise $\delta_n = 0$.

Case 3.1: $x_1 + x_{n-1} \leqslant 1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\|$.
If $x_n \leqslant x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_{n-1} - x_n)\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} + \eta_n + x_{n-1} - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} - (x_{n-1} - x_n)\\ &= \gamma - x_n + 0 + x_{n-1} - 0 - (x_{n-1} - x_n) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

If $x_{n-1} \leqslant x_n \leqslant 1 - x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1}\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} + \eta_n + x_{n-1} - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\}\\ &= \gamma - x_{n-1} + 0 + x_{n-1} - 0 = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $x_n \geqslant 1 - x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_1 + x_n - 1)\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} + \eta_n + x_{n-1} - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} - (x_1 + x_n - 1)\\ &= \gamma - x_{n-1} + (x_1 + x_n - 1) + x_{n-1} - 0 - (x_1 + x_n - 1) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Case 3.2: $x_1 + x_{n-1} > 1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|[0,1] \setminus (X_1 \cup X_{n-1})\|$.
If $x_n \leqslant 1 - x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1} - (1 - x_1 - x_n)\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} + \eta_n + x_{n-1} - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} - (1 - x_1 - x_n)\\ &= \gamma - x_n + 0 + x_{n-1} - (x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1) - (1 - x_1 - x_n) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

If $1 - x_1 \leqslant x_n \leqslant x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1}\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} + \eta_n + x_{n-1} - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\}\\ &= \gamma - x_n + (x_n + x_1 - 1) + x_{n-1} - (x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $x_n \geqslant x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_n - x_{n-1})\\ &= \gamma - \mu_{n-1} + \eta_n + x_{n-1} - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} - (x_n - x_{n-1})\\ &= \gamma - x_{n-1} + (x_n + x_1 - 1) + x_{n-1} - (x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1) - (x_n - x_{n-1}) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Case 4: $n - 1 \in E^-$, $n \in E^+$. We may assume $\|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\| < x_n < 1 - \|X_{n-1} \setminus X_1\|$ since otherwise $\delta_n = 0$.

Case 4.1: $x_1 + x_{n-1} \leqslant 1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|X_1 \cap X_{n-1}\|$.

If $x_n \leqslant x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_1 - x_n)\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_1 - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} - (x_1 - x_n)\\ &= \gamma + 0 - x_n + x_1 - 0 - (x_1 - x_n) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

If $x_1 \leqslant x_n \leqslant 1 - x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1}\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_1 - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\}\\ &= \gamma + 0 - x_1 + x_1 - 0 = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $x_n \geqslant 1 - x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_{n-1} + x_n - 1)\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_1 - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} - (x_{n-1} + x_n - 1)\\ &= \gamma + (x_{n-1} + x_n - 1) - x_1 + x_1 - 0 - (x_{n-1} + x_n - 1) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Case 4.2: $x_1 + x_{n-1} > 1$. In this case $\delta_{n-1} = \|[0,1] \setminus (X_1 \cup X_{n-1})\|$.

If $x_n \leqslant 1 - x_{n-1}$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1} - (1 - x_{n-1} - x_n)\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_1 - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} - (1 - x_{n-1} - x_n)\\ &= \gamma + 0 - x_n + x_1 - (x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1) - (1 - x_{n-1} - x_n) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

If $1 - x_{n-1} \leqslant x_n \leqslant x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1}\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_1 - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\}\\ &= \gamma + (x_{n-1} + x_n - 1) - x_n + x_1 - (x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

Finally, if $x_n \geqslant x_1$ then

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_n &= \delta_{n-1} - (x_n - x_1)\\ &= \gamma + \eta_{n-1} - \mu_n + x_1 - \max\{0,\, x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1\} - (x_n - x_1)\\ &= \gamma + (x_{n-1} + x_n - 1) - x_1 + x_1 - (x_{n-1} + x_1 - 1) - (x_n - x_1) = \gamma.\end{aligned}$$

B Detailed computational results

Table 3: Detailed results for random graphs $G(10, p)$, $p \in \{0.3, 0.4, 0.5\}$.

	$G(10, 0.3)$			$G(10, 0.4)$			$G(10, 0.5)$		
P	$\mu_P - 1$ [%]	σ_P [%]	c_P	$\mu_P - 1$ [%]	σ_P [%]	c_P	$\mu_P - 1$ [%]	σ_P [%]	c_P
M	2.31	2.16	12.96	5.03	2.80	18.52	7.30	3.88	22.10
MT	0.37	0.53	2.82	0.75	0.78	8.55	1.03	0.74	13.91
MQ	2.22	2.04	0.08	4.59	2.57	1.11	6.36	3.40	2.82
MQ_4	2.22	2.04	0.08	4.59	2.57	1.07	6.36	3.40	2.69
MQ_5				4.99	2.81	0.04	7.18	3.78	0.13
MQ_6									
MQ_7									
MQ_8									
MC	2.27	2.15	0.08	4.22	2.29	1.11	5.48	2.90	2.82
MC_4	2.27	2.15	0.08	4.23	2.29	1.07	5.48	2.90	2.69
MC_5				4.94	2.70	0.04	6.98	3.72	0.13
MC_6									
MC_7									
MC_8									
MG	2.26	2.15	0.08	4.24	2.31	1.11	5.46	2.89	2.82
MG_4	2.26	2.15	0.08	4.24	2.31	1.07	5.47	2.89	2.69
MG_5				4.94	2.70	0.04	6.97	3.72	0.13
MG_6									
MG_7									
MG_8									
MO	1.45	1.70	31.83	2.58	1.95	338.44	3.58	2.57	1344.56
MO_4	1.56	1.79	4.03	2.84	2.04	18.08	3.97	2.77	36.01
MO_5	2.08	1.97	5.77	4.15	2.43	34.76	5.70	3.23	84.04
MO_6	2.26	2.11	6.99	4.72	2.62	57.55	6.66	3.59	169.53
MO_7	2.30	2.15	6.99	4.95	2.75	76.85	7.10	3.78	280.38
MO_8	2.31	2.15	5.10	5.01	2.79	77.90	7.26	3.85	352.91
MO_9	2.31	2.16	2.37	5.03	2.80	53.39	7.29	3.87	298.26
MO_{10}	2.31	2.16	0.58	5.03	2.80	19.91	7.30	3.88	123.43

Table 4: Detailed results for random graphs $G(10, p)$, $p \in \{0.6, 0.7, 0.8\}$.

P	$G(10, 0.6)$			$G(10, 0.7)$			$G(10, 0.8)$		
	$\mu_P - 1$ [%]	σ_P [%]	c_P	$\mu_P - 1$ [%]	σ_P [%]	c_P	$\mu_P - 1$ [%]	σ_P [%]	c_P
M	10.57	3.11	26.79	13.23	3.77	31.54	16.17	3.45	36.29
MT	1.04	0.65	25.27	1.12	0.57	41.13	1.09	0.62	62.91
MQ	8.54	2.69	10.73	9.84	3.30	32.80	11.76	3.66	95.84
MQ_4	8.54	2.69	9.30	9.84	3.30	24.57	11.76	3.66	57.60
MQ_5	9.57	2.73	1.36	11.09	3.27	7.03	12.23	3.76	29.00
MQ_6	10.47	3.08	0.07	12.40	3.38	1.11	13.49	3.59	8.06
MQ_7				12.99	3.56	0.09	14.99	3.55	1.12
MQ_8							15.96	3.53	0.06
MC	6.07	2.11	10.73	5.26	2.11	32.80	4.06	2.10	95.84
MC_4	6.13	2.09	9.30	5.52	2.01	24.57	4.59	1.98	57.60
MC_5	8.70	2.66	1.36	7.56	3.23	7.03	5.21	3.54	29.00
MC_6	10.31	3.13	0.07	11.17	4.04	1.11	8.38	4.94	8.06
MC_7				12.61	3.93	0.09	12.75	5.18	1.12
MC_8							15.64	3.87	0.06
MG	6.01	2.10	10.73	5.26	2.11	32.80	4.01	2.11	95.84
MG_4	6.08	2.08	9.30	5.53	2.00	24.57	4.54	1.99	57.60
MG_5	8.68	2.66	1.36	7.55	3.23	7.03	5.16	3.54	29.00
MG_6	10.31	3.12	0.07	11.18	4.02	1.11	8.35	4.98	8.06
MG_7				12.61	3.91	0.09	12.74	5.20	1.12
MG_8							15.64	3.88	0.06
MO	4.87	2.17	6190.09	5.76	2.26	25842.53	6.70	2.39	85320.32
MO_4	5.33	2.39	77.32	6.26	2.42	151.31	7.13	2.57	266.59
MO_5	7.81	2.51	219.50	9.18	2.89	511.68	10.76	2.90	1032.90
MO_6	9.35	2.76	539.28	11.26	3.27	1501.07	13.39	3.11	3473.78
MO_7	10.14	2.95	1087.62	12.43	3.53	3619.19	14.94	3.26	9613.17
MO_8	10.46	3.05	1667.75	12.98	3.68	6661.06	15.75	3.37	20372.89
MO_9	10.56	3.10	1714.18	13.18	3.75	8257.84	16.07	3.43	29256.86
MO_{10}	10.57	3.11	884.44	13.22	3.77	5140.38	16.16	3.44	21304.13

Table 5: Detailed results for random graphs $G(15, p)$, $p \in \{0.2, 0.3\}$.

	$G(15, 0.2)$			$G(15, 0.3)$		
P	$\mu_P - 1$ [%]	σ_P [%]	c_P	$\mu_P - 1$ [%]	σ_P [%]	c_P
M	2.54	1.91	21.56	5.21	2.47	31.49
MT	0.72	0.65	4.23	1.26	0.76	12.14
MQ	2.53	1.90	0.08	4.94	2.27	0.76
MQ_4	2.53	1.90	0.08	4.94	2.27	0.76
MC	2.50	1.89	0.08	4.77	2.12	0.76
MC_4	2.50	1.89	0.08	4.77	2.12	0.76
MG	2.50	1.89	0.08	4.77	2.12	0.76
MG_4	2.50	1.89	0.08	4.77	2.12	0.76
MO	1.35	1.35	644.02	2.45	1.58	24709.70
MO_4	1.55	1.42	8.07	2.97	1.81	32.48
MO_5	2.16	1.67	15.64	3.92	1.94	89.63
MO_6	2.41	1.81	27.36	4.59	2.17	226.97
MO_7	2.50	1.87	45.99	4.96	2.31	537.75
MO_8	2.53	1.90	71.38	5.12	2.40	1158.79
MO_9	2.54	1.91	97.17	5.19	2.45	2210.63
MO_{10}	2.54	1.91	111.98	5.21	2.46	3630.97
MO_{11}	2.54	1.91	110.50	5.21	2.47	4944.42
MO_{12}	2.54	1.91	87.44	5.21	2.47	5309.26
MO_{13}	2.54	1.91	50.61	5.21	2.47	4131.57
MO_{14}	2.54	1.91	16.58	5.21	2.47	2012.32
MO_{15}	2.54	1.91	1.30	5.21	2.47	424.91

References

[1] B. Assarf, E. Gawrilow, K. Herr, M. Joswig, B. Lorenz, A. Paffenholz, and T. Rehn. polymake in Linear and Integer Programming. ArXiv e-prints, August 2014. arXiv:1408.4653.

[2] B. Assarf, E. Gawrilow, K. Herr, M. Joswig, B. Lorenz, A. Paffenholz, and T. Rehn. Computing convex hulls and counting integer points with polymake. ArXiv e-prints, November 2015. arXiv:1507.08703.

[3] E. Balas, S. Ceria, and G. Cornuéjols. A lift-and-project cutting plane algorithm for mixed 0–1 programs. *Mathematical Programming*, 58(1):295–324, 1993.

[4] N. Boland, S. S. Dey, T. Kalinowski, M. Molinaro, and F. Rigterink. Bounding the gap between the McCormick relaxation and the convex hull for bilinear functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 2016. Advance online publication, 13 pages. DOI: 10.1007/s10107-016-1031-5.

[5] P. Bonami, O. Günlük, and J. T. Linderoth. Solving Box-Constrained Nonconvex Quadratic Programs. Optimization Online e-prints, June 2016. optimization-online:5488.

[6] M. Conforti, G. Cornuéjols, and G. Zambelli. Extended formulations in combinatorial optimization. *4OR*, 8(1):1–48, 2010.

[7] O. Günlük, J. Lee, and J. Leung. A Polytope for a Product of Real Linear Functions in 0/1 Variables. In J. Lee and S. Leyffer, editors, *Mixed Integer Nonlinear Programming*, volume 154 of *The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*, pages 513–529. Springer New York, 2012.

[8] A. A. Hagberg, D. A. Schult, and P. J. Swart. Exploring Network Structure, Dynamics, and Function using NetworkX. In G. Varoquaux, T. Vaught, and J. Millman, editors, *Proceedings of the 7th Python in Science Conference*, pages 11–15, Pasadena, CA, 2008.

[9] P. Hansen, B. Jaumard, M. Ruiz, and J. Xiong. Global minimization of indefinite quadratic functions subject to box constraints. *Naval Research Logistics*, 40(3):373–392, 1993.

[10] R. Horst and H. Tuy. *Global Optimization*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, third edition, 1996.

[11] J. Luedtke, M. Namazifar, and J. T. Linderoth. Some results on the strength of relaxations of multilinear functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 136(2):325–351, 2012.

[12] G. P. McCormick. Computability of global solutions to factorable nonconvex programs: Part I – Convex underestimating problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 10(1):147–175, 1976.

[13] R. Misener and C. A. Floudas. Mixed-Integer Quadratically-Constrained Quadratic Program (MIQCQP) Test Suite. helios.princeton.edu/GloMIQO/test_suite.html. Accessed: February 17, 2017.

[14] R. Misener, J. B. Smadbeck, and C. A. Floudas. Dynamically generated cutting planes for mixed-integer quadratically constrained quadratic programs and their incorporation into GloMIQO 2. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 30(1):215–249, 2015.

[15] S. Niskanen and P. R. J. Östergård. Cliquer User's Guide, Version 1.0. Technical Report T48, Helsinki University of Technology Communications Laboratory, Espoo, Finland, 2003.

[16] M. W. Padberg. The boolean quadric polytope: Some characteristics, facets and relatives. *Mathematical Programming*, 45(1–3):139–172, 1989.

[17] A. D. Rikun. A Convex Envelope Formula for Multilinear Functions. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 10(4):425–437, 1997.

[18] H. D. Sherali. Convex envelopes of multilinear functions over a unit hypercube and over special discrete sets. *Acta Mathematica Vietnamica*, 22(1):245–270, 1997.

[19] H. D. Sherali, Y. Lee, and W. P. Adams. A simultaneous lifting strategy for identifying new classes of facets for the Boolean quadric polytope. *Operations Research Letters*, 17(1):19–26, 1995.

[20] M. Tawarmalani, J.-P. P. Richard, and C. Xiong. Explicit convex and concave envelopes through polyhedral subdivisions. *Mathematical Programming*, 138(1):531–577, 2012.

[21] M. Zuckerberg. *A Set Theoretic Approach to Lifting Procedures for 0, 1 Integer Programming*. PhD thesis, Columbia University, 2004.

[22] M. Zuckerberg. Geometric proofs for convex hull defining formulations. *Operations Research Letters*, 44(5):625–629, 2016.